

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XII.—APRIL, 1887.—No. 46.

THE BOSTON OF WINTHROP.

The Emancipation of Massachusetts. By Brooks Adams. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1887. 12mo. pp. 382.

The Quaker Invasion of Massachusetts. By Richard P. Hallowell. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1887. 18mo. pp. 229.

BOOKS continue to emanate from the press on the subject of the early history of New England. Not only in this country, but also in England, men are studying the motives, plan and management of the colonies which became in time a potent factor in breaking the ties that bound the thirteen colonies and provinces to the mother country, and in establishing a republic.

One would think that with all the light thrown on the subject, with the material presented by historical societies, local and general histories, the history of the colonies of Plymouth, Massachusetts Bay, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Providence Plantations, New Haven and Connecticut, ought to be tolerably well known.

Yet on the 21st of December, A.D. 1886, before the Congregational Club of Boston,—it was after dinner, we admit,—the Rev. Dr. Heman Lincoln, one of the professors of Newton Theological Seminary, is reported to have said: “Looking at this presence to-night, I say there is more dormant Christian energy in these men and women than is sufficient to convert this city to Jesus Christ,

though the city of Collins and O'Brien is not quite the city of Winthrop and the Pilgrims."

As to the city intended by the somewhat enigmatical expression, "the city of Collins and O'Brien," there can be little doubt that the reverend professor used these words to describe Boston, of which the Hon. Hugh O'Brien, a Catholic gentleman, evidently of Irish origin in whole or in part, is the respected chief magistrate, raised to his position by the vote of the people in successive elections. What city he designed to bring to our minds by the words, "the city of Winthrop and the Pilgrims," is not so clear. When Winthrop came over, in 1630, with the great emigration, he founded the city of Boston. We feel somewhat sure on that point, as two of our ancestors accompanied him. Nearly a decade before that the Pilgrims, so called, founded Plymouth; and the Congregational Club met on December 21st to commemorate the landing of the Pilgrims. Now what city did Winthrop *and* the Pilgrims found? What is their city? Where are we to look for it? It occurred to us, after some pondering on this enigma, that the reverend speaker may have meant Providence. When Massachusetts Bay, of which Winthrop may have been taken as a rhetorical personification, and Plymouth of the Pilgrims drove men and women into exile, in mid-winter even, for exercising the very right which they themselves claimed as fundamental, the right of private judgment, the right of free thought, the right to deny the spiritual supremacy of any men who had not an express warrant from God, the city of Providence was founded by Roger Williams, more fortunate than Mrs. Hutchinson, Nicholas Upsall, Gorton, and others. Providence may thus, in a certain sense, be called the city of Winthrop and the Pilgrims. But he would scarcely, even after dinner, tell his hearers the truism that Boston was not Providence. Perhaps, however, the speaker intended to stop at Winthrop, and the words, "the Pilgrims," are redundant. He may have intended to compare the Boston of our day with the Boston of Winthrop's day. Boston of the old intolerance, where a few ministers from England set themselves up as infallible teachers of religion and dispensers of the mysteries of the kingdom of God, ruled the people with a rod of iron and drove beyond the limits of their cleared fields Williams, Mrs. Hutchinson, and every other man or woman who denied their self-assumed authority or claimed the right of private judgment. He may have wished to compare the city of Winthrop, where it would be absurd to claim that the Spirit of God dwelt as in a chosen temple, with the Boston of our day, where the logical result of the teaching and polity of the ministers of Winthrop's day has produced its natural fruit in Agnosticism, Transcendentalism, Unitarianism, in the general decay of all faith in Christ or Christian revelation among the descendants

of the early settlers, and where the only hope of a Christian future is in the Catholic Church, now free there to do its work, and steadily, earnestly recalling men to belief in a personal God, in redemption through Christ, in revelation, in the necessity of an infallible Church to teach with one unfaltering accent the revealed truth and maintain from age to age the worship which God prescribed that men should render unto Him as the solemn public act of homage, allegiance and obedience.

It is by her that the city is to be converted to Jesus Christ, by her living, active, loving and patient energy, not by the dormant energy of any self-appointed men and women even at a dinner-table. "Non dormitat neque dormiet qui custodit Israel."

Evidently the professor's ideas as to early New England were, in the extreme, vague and confused. A little study of the subject may not be amiss, and some recent publications give us an opportunity which we hope not to abuse, for we do not think many of our readers are so obtuse as to talk of a city founded by Winthrop *and* the Pilgrims.

In a sense not perhaps intended by the learned gentleman, the Boston of to day is not the Boston of Winthrop's day—the Boston with a Catholic mayor and the Angelus sounding from convent and spire,

"As though a better world conversed with ours,"

is not the Boston where Catholicity was prohibited, where sympathy with Quakers brought banishment, ruin and death in prison on one of the earliest settlers. The progress has certainly been in the right direction.

Though an almost Chinese adoration of ancestors has long prevailed in Massachusetts, and, like other forms of paganism, entailed necessarily a clouding of the intellectual faculties, producing from time to time strange exhibitions, which those who see from afar regard with pitying wonder, there seems to be an occasional symptom of recovery from the strange delusion. A number of the usual commonplaces will, of course, from time to time be strung together, especially under the influence of a good dinner, eloquence and exhilarating accompaniments of the banquet hall; but a critical historical spirit which discusses with keen and unbiased judgment other branches of American history, must weigh the early annals of New England and give that part of the country its proper place, without yielding to pious exaggerations by loving descendants of her men of former days, or to the jealousies which may characterize other parts of the country.

Men of every other State, where there were early annals and early worthies, naturally felt a little weary of the loud and constant

claim of New Englanders not only that their forefathers and all the institutions established by their forefathers were alike stamped with the highest brand of human excellence and merit, but that all that was really good and exalted in the institutions of the whole country emanated from one source, the early men and early institutions of New England. A sort of instinctive resentment at this pretension may, perhaps, have biased in some degree the judgment of writers in other States so that it cannot be appealed to as perfectly impartial. Indeed, any treatment of a New England topic by a non-resident of New England, even if of New England birth or race, is apt to draw on the offender the severe and serious animadversion of those who feel especially selected in the designs of Providence to maintain the history as handed piously down from sire to son. Of this Dr. George H. Moore is a signal example, and his discussions, marked by great research, felicitous illustration, perspicuity of style, and closeness of reasoning, seem only to provoke hostile counter arguments, which evince too much temper where fruitful investigation and critical discrimination of historical material were requisite.

The correction of the undue laudation of everything and anything, of false principles of government enunciated as a justification for mistaken legislative or judicial action, of acts illegal, cruel and rebellious, must, to have real effect, come from New Englanders in New England. It is only by that agency and there that a change can be effected which will spread over the country and lead to the suppression of much that is fallacious and deceptive in our school books, our newspapers, and the literature we encounter from childhood to age.

The first book that attempted to counteract the idolatry was Oliver's "Puritan Commonwealth," but that work was greeted with such a unanimous exhibition of dangerous hostility that it produced very little beneficial effect.

"The Emancipation of Massachusetts," by Brooks Adams, is the most recent and most striking work in review and condemnation of the spirit underlying early New England institutions and polity. The author announces at the outset his own dogmatic uncreed. God could reveal to men no body of truths which they could be required to believe when imparted by His authorized agents. God could establish no service of worship as due Him which man could be required to render. The Catholic Church was preëminently the enemy of human freedom, in that she required men to believe because God revealed, and would not recognize as a truth the proposition that God must be equally pleased whether men believe or disbelieve Him, obey or disobey Him. That the "Reformation" merely claimed the right for government or power of

any kind to impose its own set of opinions on others, making truth consist in the power to enforce them. To Mr. Brooks Adams the Pope is the incarnation of spiritual tyranny, Cromwell the champion of freedom of conscience! (p. 5). With such a strange confusion of ideas, he cannot be very clear or logical, but, though a New Englander in thought and training, he attacks the weak points in his section's history more vigorously than he can show any plan of campaign or object to be attained. It is not easy to see from what Massachusetts was emancipated. It is not yet emancipated from subservience to religious systems based on the "I think" of some man or set of men.

But in his array of facts he sweeps away many common fallacies as to early times in Massachusetts. The oft-repeated statement that persecution drove the Separatists and Puritans to New England is but a delusion. Mr. Adams puts this very clearly: "Many able pastors had been deprived in England for non-conformity, and they had to choose between *silence* and exile. To men of their temperament silence would have been intolerable; and most must have depended upon their profession for support. America, therefore, offered a convenient refuge. The motives are less obvious which induced the leading laymen, some of whom were of fortune and consequence at home, to face the hardships of the wilderness. Persecution cannot be the explanation, for a government under which Hampden and Cromwell could live and be returned to Parliament was not intolerable; nor does it appear that any of them had been severely dealt with."

The Catholics who sought refuge in Maryland were really fugitives for conscience's sake, but to assert it of either the Plymouth Separatists or Massachusetts Bay Puritans is folly. The founders of neither colony had been severely dealt with, and leading men among them were returned to Parliament. Their ministers were not allowed to hold livings in a church which they did not believe in, and from which they should have withdrawn to entitle them to respect for any courage on their part.

How different was the case of the Catholics! Two priests were hanged and sixty banished in 1618; men who had the courage of their faith, not men hypocritically holding office in the Established Church till their real religious belief was discovered, but manfully professing the old faith England had held for centuries. The Catholics suffered just before the landing of the Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock. In 1628, shortly before Winthrop led the large emigration to Boston, a priest and a Catholic layman were hanged; in 1641 no fewer than ten priests were hanged and nine others imprisoned. Of the Catholic laity it could not be said that none of them had been severely dealt with. They were constantly fined

and imprisoned for refusing to attend the services of the Established Church; harboring a priest, having a Catholic Bible or anything Catholic from abroad, was a penal offence, rigorously punished. In their case there was real persecution to fly from; in the case of the Puritans, none. Yet this fiction is perpetuated in poems and school-books, in dinner-table oratory, and even in state papers. Surely it is time that it should stop. If Mr. Adams's book shames writers and speakers into a little regard for truth in this matter, he will not have labored in vain.

The object of the emigration of the founders of New England was not to escape persecution. "There can be little doubt that the controlling incentive with many of those who sailed was the hope, with the aid of their divines, of founding a religious commonwealth in the wilderness which should harmonize with their interpretation of Scripture." This makes their case analogous with that of Mormons emigrating to Utah.

"The execution of this project was, however, far from easy. It would have been most unsafe for the emigrants to have divulged their true designs, since these were not only unlawful, but would have been highly offensive to the king, and yet they were too feeble to exist without the protection of Great Britain; therefore, it was necessary to secure for themselves the rights of English subjects, and to throw some semblance at least of the sanction of law over the organization of their new State."

Contrast this acting in bad faith with the noble conduct of the Catholics, Sir George Peckham and Sir Thomas Gerard, when they planned a Catholic settlement in America in connection with Sir Humphrey Gilbert. They resorted to no evasions or false pretences; they sought directly the queen's sanction and a suspension of the penalties hanging over them.

For Winthrop's settlement a corporation was organized in England, on the plan of trading companies; this, in March, 1629, obtained of Charles I. a charter, under which the stockholders or freemen were to meet quarterly, and they were empowered to choose a governor, deputy governor, and eighteen assistants or directors. The quarterly meeting or General Court was empowered to admit new members or freemen to the corporation, and "to make laws and ordinances for the good and welfare of the said company, and for the government and ordering of the said lands and plantations, and the people inhabiting and to inhabit the same, as to them from time to time shall be thought meet, so as such laws and ordinances be not contrary or repugnant to the laws and statutes of this our realm of England."

This instrument created an English corporation, whose only lawful business was the American trade, with special powers for

trading purposes in the territory granted between the Merrimac and the Charles; but the governing body could legally exercise its functions only when domiciled in some English town. The charter gave them no power to set up a government in America, with power to make laws, establish courts of justice, create a local state church, punish offenders against its laws even by capital punishment, adopt a new flag, or coin money. Yet all these acts, inherent in the national government of the English people, were usurped and exercised over British subjects by this corporation.

One shallow critic, speaking of the work now under review, says: "Thousands of colonists, settled in a community so remote from the central power, could not be kept in order unless the right to inflict fines, imprisonment, and even death was conceded." But the fact is that no such power was conceded, and the powers obtained by the charter were for a body in England under the jurisdiction of English courts, and the corporators transferred their organization to Massachusetts to escape control. And what the legislature of the nation did not concede then in fact, we cannot concede now for argument.

The land between the Merrimac and Charles was bought by an association in 1628 from the Council of Plymouth, and settlers began to go over before and after the royal charter was obtained. The settlers going over had all the rights and all the duties of British subjects. Yet even before the charter was transmitted or government established, the Brownes were expelled for holding public worship according to the forms prescribed by the law of England, and Gardiner on suspicion of being a Catholic. So little idea of civil or religious liberty prevailed among these people who are held up to us as types, that as early as 1631 a minister was called to account by his associates because he had said that the Church of Rome was a true Church of Christ!

In 1630 the corporators assumed to transfer the whole government of the corporation with the charter to New England, and the first General Court was held at Boston, in October, 1630. The charter was based on that of trading corporations, although Palfrey endeavors to show that it never really was one, never had any capital, any stock, or stockholders paying for stock. It conferred on the corporation no such legislative power as was given to Lord Baltimore two years later.

Legislation had begun, however, even before the meeting of the General Court, and it is not creditable to the first ministers of Massachusetts. On the 23d of August a Court of Assistants had met. "The question first considered was that of provision for the ministers." It was "ordered that houses be built for them with convenient speed at the public charge." "Allowances of thirty

pounds a year to each of these gentlemen were to be made at the common charge of the settlements," says Palfrey. What disinterested men! While the colonists were struggling, each to raise a house for himself and his family, to clear ground and put in a crop, these ministers folded their arms and obtained an enactment that the rest should build for them and pay out of the fruits of their labors a salary. Contrast this with the conduct of the two Catholic priests, White and Altham, who came out with Calvert's colony to Maryland two years later. They bore their part on the voyage, they brought out men to assist in building up the province, as artisans and cultivators; they took up land like all the other gentlemen adventurers, and put up their own houses and chapels, and never during the whole colonial period received a salary from the flocks to which they ministered. Which is more worthy of the respect of mankind, the self-seeking ministers of Massachusetts, or the self-denying priests of Maryland?

When the General Court met, a hundred and eighteen colonists, many of whom had been for some time settled there, asked to be received as freemen or corporators under the charter. But besides the Governor, Deputy Governor and Assistants, there seem to have been none of the freemen of the Company in Massachusetts. To admit the host of new members would sweep the few managers out of power, and they at once ordered that the Assistants, with the Governor and Deputy Governor elected by them, "should have the power of making laws and choosing officers to execute the same." Thus the ten assistants, or even seven of them, as subsequently provided, with the Governor and Deputy Governor, usurped the power of the whole corporation, and assumed powers that the whole corporation did not possess. The government set up was an oligarchy without authority from the charter or the English Parliament. It began by disfranchising the very pioneers who first planted Christian homes in that land.

Such an oligarchy could not be maintained long, and in 1634 a new modification took place. The Governor, Deputy Governor and Assistants were elected by a general vote, and each town sent two deputies to Boston. For this system there was of course no warrant in the charter and no special authority from Parliament. Had the franchise been general, such a system might have been approved in England, and could be praised now. But the Massachusetts clergy, who at the outset looked out for their own well-being, were not disposed to let the elective franchise fall into hands that they did not control. The reverend professor of Newton Seminary might well deplore that the days of Winthrop were past and gone. He and his class no longer possess the power of excluding the men of Massachusetts from the ballot-box. The

very year after the landing of Winthrop, the ministry induced their pliant tools, the Assistants, to enact "that for time to come noe man shalbe admitted to the freedome of this body polliticke, but such as are members of some of the churches within . . . the same." Thus from the outset, as the membership in the churches was in the hands of the ministers, the right of freeman was equally so. No man applying for membership in the church would be received who might be suspected of being dangerous or unmanageable at the polls. Thus the whole civil power was in the hands of the ministry and their confederates or pliant tools. This system lasted, in spite of attempts to check or modify it, down to the close of the first quarter of the present century. Contrast this with Maryland, in which the Catholic landholders had control. The priests, though summoned as freemen, asked to be excused. They took no part in legislation; they made no attempt to gather all power into their own hands.

As Adams not inaptly puts it: "The sad countenance, the Biblical speech, the sombre garb, the austere life, the attendance at worship, and, above all, the unfailing deference paid to themselves, were the marks of sanctification by which the elders knew the saints on earth, for whom they were to open the path to fortune by making them members of the church."

The man who was not pliant enough to become a member fared badly. He could not vote or enjoy any privilege reserved to freemen: he was discriminated against in trade; he was compelled to attend the Congregational service or pay heavy fines; he could not obtain admission to the two recognized sacraments for himself or his children; those children must live and die unbaptized.

The Catholic Church is denounced and will be denounced by ignorant prejudice as inimical to human rights and human liberty, but in no time and in no country has she ever exercised any such power as was wielded by the Massachusetts ministers, who narrowed all civil and religious rights to the circle of their own sycophants.

In the Catholic Church doctrine and discipline are known; where anything is said or done against either, a recognized judiciary decides, and from it lies an appeal. All are admitted to the sacraments, none are excluded; she has but one rite for rich or poor, and excludes no child from the salutary waters of baptism.

It was not in human nature that intelligent beings who had been lured by fine phrases about freedom from ecclesiastical tyranny could live quietly under such a soul-crushing despotism. Men who wished to use the Book of Common Prayer were promptly sent out of the colony, men suspected of Popery were as promptly expelled, men who failed in respect to the ministers were promptly punished.

What they set up as divine worship was simply appalling. Any one who has attempted to read the prolonged sermons of these early New England ministers knows how hard, dry and repulsive they are, and what a thing of terror they make the life of a Christian on earth. Not a single sermon has ever been cited as a piece of Christian eloquence or beauty; not one figures in works on American literature as indicative of genius, talent, or high spirituality. In their service the sermon was the main part, and the extemporaneous prayer previously prepared was of the same type as the sermon; the singing was limited to metrical versions of the Psalms, like the Bay Psalm Book, which shock all literary and religious ideas; and the singing, even as modified in later years, and as many remember it at the beginning of this century, was devoid of every attractive and musical feature. And men had substituted this for the awful sacrifice of the Mass, in which man, through Christ, the high priest and victim, seeks reconciliation with the Father, offers his adoration, his petition, his praise; substituted this for the Mass, with the Gregorian music echoing the very strains that swelled beneath the roof of the temple at Jerusalem, for the sermons full of all the charms that God's love gives to encourage the just and win the sinner!

People began at an early day to writhe under this cold, cruel, selfish tyranny of formalism. But men lacked courage. It needed a woman to pave the way. As it was, British subjects in a British province were deprived of the rights of Englishmen, unless they renounced the church established by law and became the puppets of ministers who did not recognize that church and punished those who did.

Mrs. Hutchinson came to Boston in 1634. She was earnest and pious; but she ventured to express her opinion of the ministers. She was reported to have said that "none of them did preach the covenant of free grace, but Master Cotton." The ministers of the colony were arrayed against her, although the Governor, Sir Henry Vane, and the church in Boston befriended her. But her kinsman, the minister Wheelwright, was soon arraigned for sedition and condemned. The colony was divided, but the minister party prevailed, elected Winthrop Governor, and to keep friends of Wheelwright and Mrs. Hutchinson from settling in the colony, passed a law to forbid any town to entertain strangers for more than three weeks without the consent of two of the magistrates. Winthrop, in controversy with Vane, claimed that they had power to do so, appealing to the very charter which they had actually and virtually abandoned, as though the power that patent gave to admit freemen authorized them to prevent British subjects from entering a British province. Preposterous as Winthrop's

argument was, it has been followed to this day, and a writer in the *New York Nation* in the year 1887 has the face to say: "If they prohibited all dissent, it was on the ground that the New World was open to other communities, and that they had bought this little corner at a great price." Even according to our modern ideas they were right in this!" Mr. Adams well declares that "such arguments as those advanced by Winthrop were only solemn quibbling to cloak an indefensible policy." "To subject Englishmen to restriction or punishment unknown to English law was as outrageous as the same act would have been had it been perpetrated by the city of London,—both corporations having a like power to preserve the peace by local ordinances, and both being controlled by the law of the land as administered by the courts." Wheelwright, tried without specific indictment, without the testimony of witnesses against him, without jury, was sentenced to be disfranchised and banished. He demanded an appeal to the King. It was refused. He and his in the heart of winter had to make their way through the wilderness to the Piscataqua. Others were disfranchised and banished, and fifty-eight of the less prominent were disarmed in Boston alone. All this was done by men who had cried out against the bishops in England for enforcing the law against nonconformists!

In November, 1637, Mrs. Hutchinson was brought before Winthrop, the Deputy Governor, and the ministers. Winthrop, as Adams well puts it, acted as "presiding justice, attorney-general, foreman of the jury, and chief magistrate of Massachusetts Bay."

It was certainly not in the character of presiding judge that he thus addressed her:

"We have thought good to send for you . . . that if you be in an erroneous way we may reduce you so that you may become a profitable member here among us; otherwise, if you be obstinate, . . . that then the Court may take such course that you may trouble us no further—therefore I would entreat you . . . whether you do not justify Mr. Wheelwright's sermon and the petition."

This lone woman, arraigned before these unfeeling men, who kept her standing for hours, though far advanced in pregnancy, demanded to know of what she was accused: "I am called here to answer before you, but I hear no things laid to my charge."

Winthrop said she had joined the faction in presenting the petition, but she could reply: "I had not my hand to the petition." They endeavored to maintain that by entertaining petitioners at her house she had set forward the faction and dishonored her present judges. "I do acknowledge no such thing; neither do I think I ever put dishonor upon you."

The ministers then came forward to testify that she had declared

that they preached a covenant of works. She refuted them by calling witnesses to prove the contrary. All that they could show was that when pressed by the ministers she had said that they did not preach the covenant of free grace as clearly as Mr. Cotton had done. But evidence availed little. Winthrop pronounced the sentence: "Mrs. Hutchinson, the sentence of the Court you hear is that you are banished from out of our jurisdiction as being a woman not fit for our society, and are to be imprisoned till the Court shall send you away."

"I desire to know wherefore I am banished." "Say no more," replied Winthrop; "the Court knows wherefore, and is satisfied."

That was the course of justice in the Boston of Winthrop. Is the Boston of O'Brien, where people are indicted for specific offences described on the statute books, tried by impartial judges, the testimony on both sides weighed by a jury, and an appeal allowed if any probable error appears—is this Boston of O'Brien so very far below the Boston of Winthrop?

She had been tried and sentenced. Will it be credited that the ministers harassed and beset this woman and then dragged her before a tribunal to answer thirty-nine other charges, and when she went forth and was murdered by Indians these ministers openly exulted over her death? And we are complacently asked to admire the course of these men! It is in vain. The sympathy of the world is with their victim. Such was vaunted Massachusetts when Maryland established religious freedom and punished the use of opprobrious names for fellow Christians.

Massachusetts feels that the stigma of this outrageous perversion of justice cannot be explained away, and writers like Palfrey exaggerate her offence to a great civil danger imperiling the "Commonwealth." Mrs. Hutchinson's offence was her saying that the other ministers did not preach the covenant of free grace as clearly as Mr. Cotton. Now to any man not trained in New England this would not seem to be a very terrible charge. A woman is very likely to have her favorite minister and to praise him. But the grave historian Palfrey tells us: "The disputes introduced by Mrs. Hutchinson threatened no less than immediate anarchy. They had already produced some of its fruits. They had weakened the arm of government at a moment when government especially needed to be strong" Does not Tacitus say: "*Humanum est odisse quem laeseris?*"

The case of Mrs. Hutchinson settled one point. That no doctrine but that of the English nonconformists would be tolerated was already implicitly established. Her case made it treason against the state to question the authority, orthodoxy, spiritual gifts or infallibility of the ministers. The case as presented against her,

though it sufficed to send her into banishment from the Boston of Winthrop, would not, presented to a court and jury in the Boston of O'Brien, be sufficient to secure a verdict for the plaintiff in a slander suit against her.

From the time of the banishment of Wheelwright and Mrs. Hutchinson the ministers were supreme. An undesirable applicant for admission to the church was wearied out with long delays, so that a steadily increasing body of non-baptized, non-communicating people grew up, governed by men in whose election they had no voice. They were excluded from church, franchise, office, the jury-box, from commissions in the militia. This was not all; men found that in business affairs, in suits at law, they had no standing unless they were church members.

A petition to the General Court drew down on the petitioners a series of heavy fines, which were increased when the ruling powers discovered that their victims proposed to petition Parliament. Among those amerced what would be \$5000 in our day was Samuel Maverick, who had hospitably entertained Winthrop and his people on their arrival, for he was a pioneer settled in Massachusetts in 1625. In 1647 a special law was passed punishing by imprisonment for life, and by death if he broke jail and were retaken, any Jesuit who entered the colony except by shipwreck. Contrast this with the toleration act of Catholic Maryland which Puritans during a momentary sway showed all their malignity as persecutors in overthrowing the religious freedom which Catholics had persistently championed.

The complete organization of church and state took place in October, 1651, when even as against the members unanimously the voice of the ministers was to prevail. The men who mocked at Mrs. Hutchinson's theory now adopted it by holding that the will of Christ was to rule and that this will was revealed to the ministers exclusively.

Under their system many children born in Massachusetts remained unbaptized; yet strangely enough the Massachusetts ministers denounced as "murderers," and clamored for the blood of, those who denied the validity of infant baptism or its necessity. When Clark, a Baptist, demanded to be shown the law under which he was tried, Wilson, the minister, struck and cursed him, saying: "The curse of God . . . goe with thee." Holmes, another Baptist, was flogged so cruelly that for days he could not lie down or rest except on his knees and hands. And yet at the very time Winthrop and Winslow officially declared that they allowed Baptists to communicate with them. Thus, while hypocritically professing to tolerate them, they continued to persecute the Baptists till the election of Leverett in 1673. It is a curious circum-

stance, too, that the ministers and their tools in the magistracy never saw their own doings. Rev. Increase Mather is an example, who wrote in 1681: "It is more than I know, if in all that time (upward of twenty years) any of those that scruple infant baptism have met with molestation from the magistrate merely on account of their opinion."

Now, verily, we believe the ministers in Boston in O'Brien's time have not such extraordinary memories, and that if they procured the flogging and imprisonment of any one for expressing his doubt on the validity of infant baptism, they would actually know what they did.

They had expelled Episcopalians, banished Mrs. Hutchinson, flogged and imprisoned Baptists. They had refused to allow appeals to the courts in England, and they had done so with impunity. They claimed that by their purchase from the Plymouth Company of the land between the Merrimac and the Charles they possessed sovereign power over the territory running westward to the Pacific, and that they were authorized by human and Divine law to exclude from it, even by a Mountain Meadow massacre, any dissenter from their religious system who attempted to settle within those limits. Had their power been equal to their wish, they would have put Father Jogues to death on the Mohawk or Marquette on the Mississippi as idolatrous priests within their domain. The Jesuit missionaries were not within their reach, but the Quakers who invaded that strip could be made to feel the weight of their displeasure. The Quakers believed that God revealed His will to all men who sought to know it submissively, the Massachusetts divines that He made it known only to ministers called by a recognized Massachusetts congregation. John Endicott, who had shown his respect for authority by cutting the cross from the King's colors, sternly warned the first Quakers who came: "Take heed you break not our ecclesiastical laws, for then ye are sure to stretch by a halter." To be sure Endicott did this under a terrible persecution, as Dr. Dexter assures us. The Quakers persecuted the mild and gentle Puritans by their presence; but if Dr. Dexter in our day thinks so, Nicholas Upsall did not think so in the days of the persecution of the Quakers. He thought it was just the other way. He believed that the Quakers left foodless in prison were persecuted, not persecutors. He gave them food; nay, more, "in love and tenderness which he bare to the people and the place" (Boston, of which he was one of the first settlers) this good old man "desired them to take heed lest they be found fighters against God." He died in prison, a ruined man, for being the only person who dared to talk of toleration in the Boston we are called upon to admire. "*Laudo vos: In hoc non laudo.*"

The first Quakers came in 1656; in that year and the next two severe laws were passed against them. In 1659 two Quakers were hanged; in 1660 a woman was hanged; in 1661 another Quaker was hanged, and Wenlock Christison was condemned to death, but the consecrated lictors hesitated to make the murder, as they had made the law.

It is hard to enter on this topic, the darkest stain in our early history. No crime has equalled the persecution of the Quakers, except that of attempting to palliate or justify it. No law on the statute book of England made the holding of the doctrines of George Fox a capital offence. No Quaker had been put to death in England.

Quakerism was a logical outgrowth of Puritanism. The latter rejected the constitution, ministry, and orders of the Church, and proclaimed against the vices prevalent under its system. The Quakers did the same. But the Quakers rejected also, as resting on no authority, the constitution, ministry, and orders of the Puritan Church of Massachusetts Bay, and the Puritans could adduce no evidence of an historic or doctrinal basis for their creed or ministry. As we have seen, they claimed for their ministry the inner light which the Quaker believed God gave as He gave the voice of conscience to every man. Once the apostolic succession in the ministry is rejected, the Quaker ground is more logical than the Puritan.

The language of the Quakers is cited as coarse and vituperative; it certainly is not more so than that of the Puritans against the bishops and ministers of the Church of England; and certainly while "The Simple Cobbler of Aggawam" remains as a Puritan classic, emanating from the compiler of the laws, one need not even be a Catholic to find the language violently vile. The Massachusetts laws, and documents against the Quakers, may be read in "The Quaker Invasion of Massachusetts," and need no comment. They speak for themselves.

Never in any part of the British empire had British subjects been deprived of their inalienable rights, punished with fine, imprisonment, and death, for offences not recognized by the laws of England, as they were in Massachusetts, a colony created under English law.

The legal murder of the Quakers shocked and startled England, from the frivolous king to the dull yeoman. Cunning, procrastination, prevarication, were to avail no longer. These arms had so often been employed, that on one of the Quaker trials it was tauntingly said: "This year ye will go to complain to the Parliament, and the next year they will send to see how it is, and the third year the government is changed."

To save themselves, the party of intolerance in Massachusetts sent Norton and Bradstreet to England, and Bradstreet was forced by Fox to admit that he had taken part in putting the Quakers to death. When Fox asked "by what law," their reply was, "by the same law as the Jesuits were put to death in England." Fox justly replied: "It plainly appears you have put them to death arbitrarily without any law."

Charles II., in his reply to the address of Massachusetts, required the colony to repeal all laws contrary to those of England, to take the oath of allegiance, and administer justice in the king's name. Two other vital points were these: "And since the principle and foundation of that charter was, and is, the freedom of liberty of conscience, we do hereby charge and require you that that freedom and liberty be duely admitted," especially in favor of those "that desire to use the Book of Common Prayer. 2. That all the feeholders of competent estates, not vicious in conversation, orthodox in religion (though of different persuasions concerning church government), may have their vote in the election of all officers, civill or millitary."

This struck down the membership qualification for the franchise. Massachusetts would not enfranchise her helots. She issued writs in the king's name; she ceased to imbrue her hands in the blood of the followers of Fox; but she otherwise set at naught the demands of Charles II.

Then, in 1664, Maverick, Nicolls, Carr, and Cartwright were sent as commissioners. The General Court then extended the franchise to all who were certified by ministers to be orthodox in religion and not vicious in life, who had paid ten shillings at a single rate; this was followed up by a whining address to the king. They refused to allow appeals to England, or religious toleration. The oath of allegiance was evasive; the extended franchise a sham. The commissioners were baffled. Randolph, sent with another communication from the English government, was treated with contempt. Gradually, however, Massachusetts found herself beset with enemies within, on her borders, and in England, and began to see that she could not alone, at her option, refuse to obey laws to which other colonies promptly and cheerfully submitted. Yet the old duplicity was maintained. On the 11th of June Baptists were summoned before the General Court for the crime of erecting a meeting-house, and that very day the same General Court, in an address to the king, protested that all Protestant dissenters, except Quakers, were perfectly free!

Charles, finding his directions disregarded, announced his intention to direct the Attorney-General to bring a *quo warranto* to evict and make void the charter. They attempted to bribe the king, but Randolph was sent out to serve the *quo warranto*; but

without prosecuting it, a *scire facias* was issued from the Court of Chancery, and judgment was entered by default.

When James II. came to the throne all the New England colonies and New York were included in one government, with the project of forming one united province under uniform and harmonious laws. With the fall of James Massachusetts hoped to restore her old rule, but she found that William III. had a sterner mind and a stronger hand than the Stuarts. Massachusetts Bay, Maine, and Plymouth became one royal province; the governor, lieutenant-governor, and secretary were appointed by the king, and the Council was elected by the representatives of the towns. For the first time since the Puritan coming England was able to have the services of her Established Church offered in Boston. Under the new rule toleration, except for Catholics (the first to proclaim toleration), was established; a property qualification instead of congregational church membership became requisite for the franchise; laws could be vetoed by the governor, and were subject to the royal approval.

The emancipation of the people of Massachusetts from the tyranny of a dominant ministry, for which Charles and James had used their endeavors, was effected by William, whom Massachusetts had fondly hailed as a deliverer. It was the knell of the Boston of Winthrop, and the effort of the ministry in creating the witchcraft excitement, and egging on the people to hang so many of the people, instead of helping them to regain the waning power, proved almost fatal to their authority. The community whom they had held in the direst bondage, now, in emancipating itself from their authority, lost gradually what the ministers had charged the Quakers with losing, faith in the Trinity, faith in the divinity of Christ, faith in the Scriptures.

The overthrow of the old theocratic rule made the Massachusetts ministers hostile to English authority. It was mainly due to their agitation that the English government never dared to establish bishops in the colonies; and the ministry became potent agents when the troubles with England began after the conquest of Canada. The Quebec Act gave them an opportunity of rousing all the fanatical spirit of Protestantism against the English government as the protector of "Popery," as a government seeking to use that Catholic province to crush the old Protestant colonies. Before the struggle ended, they lapsed into a discreet silence, for England had become the champion of Protestantism, and America the ally of Catholic France. The selectmen of Boston—yea, even of Winthrop's Boston—followed processions headed by a cross, exciting the ridicule of English and Tories; yet the Boston of the days of the Revolution was more like the Boston of O'Brien than the Boston of Winthrop.

THE FITNESS OF THE TIME FOR THE BEATIFICATION OF THE ENGLISH MARTYRS.

THERE are many reasons why the present time seems appropriate for the beatification of the victims of English Protestantism. There are now enjoyed in England the full play of all the liberties which have been conceded by Protestantism to Catholicity, so that we can appreciate the sublime sacrifices of our forefathers by the contrast of our own ease with their sufferings. Those who live under the mild sway of Queen Victoria, and in times when the Penal Laws are quite forgotten, can ask themselves: "Is it possible that we are now professing the same religion which at one time was punishable as high treason?" Before the passing of the Emancipation Act there was still the lingering of the impression that to profess the Catholic faith was, at least, heroic; it was to defy the national conviction of what was true; it was to assert one's own readiness for social martyrdom. Fifty years ago, to be a Catholic in England—even a Catholic with a long Catholic ancestry—was to be branded as an odd, exceptional kind of Christian, whose sole plea for his eccentricity was his traditions; while to be converted to the Catholic faith was to be suspected of a moral obliquity which merited complete ostracism and even hatred. So that there was, at least, the spirit of martyrdom in all those brave English converts who, before the Emancipation Act, became Catholics. How different is conversion in these days! The Catholic religion is now regarded as intellectually the most logical and morally the most interior of all religions; so that, whatever trials the Catholic convert may experience, at least he is not regarded as a fool. More than this, there is a sort of fashion in these days of taking the widest possible views on religious liberty, and of giving everybody credit for his sincerity. Freethinking has, theoretically if not practically, allowed the principle that a man's mind is his own, and that A and B may use their minds in their own way. Persecution, and therefore martyrdom, has died out. It was just the moment to remind us, by the beatification of the English martyrs, that time was when to profess Catholicism was to court death, and even when not to deny it was to be ostracised.

It may seem ungrateful to hazard the view that, possibly, the times in which we live are the most dangerous which English Catholics have ever known. There is no motive in being a confessor when no one wishes to contradict; and there is no risk in "going to Mass" when even Anglicans do so. Where there are

no Penal Laws it is impossible to break one; and where everyone kindly admires the Catholic religion no Catholic can feel a martyr in practising it. But more than this: the popular attitude of the Protestant intellect is one that forbids approach to religious controversy. The modern Protestant (who, however, does not protest at all) is inaccessible through his coat of armor of Modern Thought. He does not meet you, as his father did, with objections to the Seven Sacraments, or with a critical examination of the Papal claims; he meets you with the hypothesis that, since nothing is quite certain, philosophy seems to point to a wise indifference. He surrounds himself with a brick wall of imperturbability, on the ground that the unknown cannot be argued; and that the first principles of reasoning have not yet been finally settled by the great thinkers who oppose science to emotion. The Catholic has, therefore, to approach the popular mind through an iron fortress which is gunned with "No Postulates," a kind of siege in which he wastes all his powder against materials that cannot feel, cannot respond. This is the temper of the now popular Agnosticism; and it is a temper which has permeated all Protestantism. The number of the simple-hearted pious Protestants is growing smaller and smaller every year. There are stiff-backed Ritualists, and there are Christian Nothingarians; but the good old-fashioned Protestant is out of date. This, then, is the very time when the spirit of the English martyrs needs to be rekindled all over England; when to recognize that there is truth, and that we must at all cost obey it, is the one sovereign need of English Christians; and when, for Catholics, there is the harder duty of facing peace, and for Protestants the harder duty of facing doubt.

The precise conditions under which the English martyrs suffered not only do not, but cannot, exist in England. Despotism is dead and buried in England; the last monarch, James the Second, who sought to revive it, having lost his throne and ruined his dynasty by the attempt. Even the Royal Supremacy is now accepted as a convenient fiction—not having affirmative, but merely negative, signification. The Queen is no more regarded as head of the Anglican Church than as the "Defender of the (Catholic Roman) faith." The Prime Minister is more of a pontiff than is the Queen; and the House of Commons is more of an arbiter than are both. It is, therefore, difficult to realize the state of things under the Tudor dynasty, when Henry the Eighth and Queen Elizabeth were *de facto* supreme pontiffs, who not only ruled the faith, but butchered "heretics." A simple stone pillar now indicates to Londoners the exact spot where "bloody Tyburn" once stood; and the Tower of London is a mere show-place for country people, or for such Londoners as have a taste for antiquarianism.

The England of 1887 and the England of 1535-1583 have nothing in common in their "Christian spirit," any more than in their political system. Religious and civil liberty are realities, not watch-words, penal laws and test-acts being extinct. Therefore it is that when we are called upon to contemplate "The Decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites confirming the honor given to the blessed martyrs, John, Cardinal Fisher, Thomas More, and others, put to death in England for the faith," we have to throw ourselves into a frame of mind which is as utterly alien to the present case as was the spirit of the early martyrs in the catacombs. Bishop Fisher or Sir Thomas More, could they be born again into the present time, with recollection of what they suffered in the sixteenth century, would keenly appreciate the significance in *these* days of Leo the Thirteenth's recent allusion to their merits: "Who for the dignity of this See, and for the truth of the orthodox faith, did not hesitate to lay down their lives by the shedding of their blood." Who thinks now of suffering martyrdom for the orthodox faith, or for the dignity of the still persecuted Holy See, in a country where it is "all the same" whether you profess the Catholic faith or write leaflets for the "Freethought Publishing Company" in Fleet Street? Catholics may feel the same earnestness in their hearts, but they are baffled by the equanimity of the times. No man can fight where there is no enemy, and Protestants are too polite now to be enemies. A firebrand here and there, like Dr. Littledale, may publish neatly-bound literary falsehoods, but books are not gallows, and sermons are not torture-chambers, nor is the "Scottish Protestant Alliance" the Tower of London. Words are easy swords for the worst swordsmen. In these days there is no antagonism, worthy the name, to stir the chivalry of the Catholic champions of the faith, our bitterest enemies, for the most part, insisting on a toleration which shall include Catholics in the same amnesty with Jews and infidels. The time, then, is well chosen for reminding us by a Papal decree that we are not of the same stuff as were the English martyrs, since it is almost impossible at the present time to mix in Protestant society and not to catch the graceful ease of indifference.

The reign of Henry the Eighth began with Catholic loyalty, and ended with a mortal conflict with the Holy See. The reign of Queen Victoria began with a hatred of Catholicity and has now attained to its jubilee of reparation. As to Queen Elizabeth's reign, it was forty years of persecution, such as Queen Victoria would rather have died than have contemplated. We can realize something of the force of this contrast if we substitute, say, Cardinal Newman for Edmund Campion; Father Christie for Cuthbert Mayne or Thomas Cottam; and Professor Mivart for John

Storey or Thomas Sherwood. Imagine these living persons being put to death, in the same fashion and in the same cause as Queen Elizabeth's countless victims, lay and priestly ! Cardinal Newman dragged to Tyburn to be butchered would be only a parallel butchery to that of Cardinal Fisher, who, however, was Henry the Eighth's grandest victim, and his most impressive Protestant lesson to his daughter. That daughter was perfectly innocent of the execution of Fisher, but she inherited a spirit of persecution which led her to martyr scores of Catholic priests. And it is just at this point we touch a subject which, though painful, cannot be ignored by the sincere Anglican inquirer, any more than by the historical critic. All historians are agreed that it was Anne Boleyn alone who suggested "religious scruples" to Henry the Eighth ; and all historians are agreed that the Princess Elizabeth was not legitimate—in the Christian, nor even in any respectable, sense. Thus Cardinal Fisher and Sir Thomas More had to lay down their lives because Anne Boleyn had fascinated a Catholic monarch ; and innumerable priests and laymen had to suffer under Elizabeth because her Majesty was illegitimately born. The origin of English Protestantism was not dignified. It may be said to have been most disreputable and most disgusting. Both in the case of Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More, it is worth observing that Henry the Eighth had always regarded them with profound honor, and had always spoken of them as irreproachable and incorruptible. So that, in butchering these two highest ornaments of his reign, he pleaded guilty to sacrificing what he had confessed to be most worthy to passions which all men knew to be most base. Yet, it would have been useless in those days (besides being contrary to the Roman rule) to have pronounced the beatification of such martyrs, for all Catholics knew that they were martyrs, while the English Protestants would have been exasperated by their beatification. Not for three hundred years was this process of their beatification to be carried to its ultimate stage by the Supreme Pontiff ; not till a time when persecution had wholly ceased, and when non-Catholics could judge the matter to their edification. The fitness of time is quite obvious, quite indubitable, in the selection of our own day for the pronouncement. Let us select a few more reasons why the world, or why society, should be impressed by the striking aptness of the lesson.

Two reasons have already been suggested : The cessation of all material persecution, and the weakening of the English faith in dogmatic truth. Leaving these two reasons for the moment,—though they will presently come back with greater force,—let us touch on other reasons of a different sort. First, the attitude of the Catholic Powers towards the Pope is wholly different from

what it was in the sixteenth century. Italy, France, Belgium, even Austria, have lost their sense of touch with the Supreme Pontiff. Italy has insulted him; Belgium has half-forsaken its old loyalty; Austria has now two standards in her Catholic State; Spain and Portugal are not wholly above corruption. With such examples from Catholic Powers, how is it possible that Protestant Powers can be disposed to show reverence to the Holy See? It may be answered that the Catholic Powers have caught the infection of that freethinking which is now rampant in all societies throughout Christendom. This is, indeed, politically, a truism. Henry the Eighth and Queen Elizabeth started a principle in England which has borne fruit for three centuries throughout Europe: the principle that politics are *not* directed by religion, but purely by expediency or selfishness. This principle was anathematized up to the sixteenth century. And it was to anathematize this principle that the fifty-four martyrs—all whose cases are now “admitted” by the Holy See—“did not hesitate to lay down their lives by the shedding of their blood.” Had Bishop Fisher or Sir Thomas More acquiesced in that principle with the same timidity with which it is acquiesced in by modern statesmen, we should not now be reaping the blessings of that magnificent example which promises to awaken the loyalty of Catholic kingdoms. The Spanish, the Italian, even the French Catholic press, have written warmly on our heritage from these martyrs. It has been pointed out, in an Italian paper, that the distinction between the victims of Henry the Eighth and the victims of his illegitimate daughter was, that the first suffered martyrdom for the supremacy of the Holy See, and the second for almost the whole Catholic faith. It might be added that the first were also victims of Henry’s passions, and the second of Queen Elizabeth’s vanity. Yet it was because the Holy See would not recognize Queen Elizabeth that she divorced her kingdom from Catholic obedience and from the Catholic faith; so that both apostasies were radically on the same ground, namely, revolt against the Pontifical authority. This revolt included all other revolts. When the Nero of the West, Henry the Eighth, dyed his hands in the blood of the noblest men in his country, he was not simply contending for *his own* supremacy, but for the principle that there is *no* spiritual authority. When Cardinal Fisher addressed the people gathered round his scaffold, “Christian people, I have come hither to die for the faith of Christ’s Holy Catholic Church,” he stated the whole truth of the case, and did not allude even to the miserable lie of the Royal Supremacy. When Sir Thomas More addressed the people round his scaffold, “I die for the faith of the Holy Catholic Church, a faithful servant of both God and the

king," he left the people to understand that, to be "a faithful servant of the king," he must give his life for the spiritual supremacy of the Holy See. This truth was so warmly appreciated at the time that all Catholic Englishmen confessed to it. Sir Gilbert Rouse, a parson in Worcestershire, said publicly that "the monks and others who were put to death in London, were martyrs before God and saints in heaven." Richard Cowley, a priest in Oxfordshire, said publicly: "Fisher and More both died for the true faith; and so would I if it were put to me." And here let it be mentioned that there is a wealth of manuscripts stored up in old English Catholic houses, which show that all the Catholic gentry of the sixteenth century regarded these first martyrs in the same light. The "Reports of the Historical Manuscript Commission" prove that such manuscripts are most voluminous in the treasured libraries of some of the old Catholic gentry. Unfortunately, there is a sort of timidity in Catholic families, which prevents their allowing these manuscripts to be published. It is not improbable that out of more than three hundred names submitted to the Promotor Fidei for beatification, many more than forty-three would have been now "admitted," had all this wealth of manuscript-testimony been forthcoming. Be this as it may, one fact is absolutely certain—that *all* the martyrs in the reign of Henry the Eighth were regarded by all the Catholics of their own time as dying for the whole Catholic faith. Nominally, they were said to die for the Pope's supremacy, but, really, they were known to die because in the confession of that supremacy was known to lie the whole confession of all Catholic truth.

Briefly, let it be added that the martyrs of Queen Elizabeth were the *vindicators* of the martyrs of Henry the Eighth, because under Elizabeth *all* truth had become questioned. There is no finer lesson for modern Anglicans, who profess "Catholicism," than the fact that *all* heresies that had ever existed for fifteen centuries were revived within forty years of Fisher's martyrdom. In other words, within forty years of the denial of the Papal supremacy, every dogma of the Catholic religion had become debated or repudiated by the heirs of those who had denied *only* the supremacy. This fact was the vindication of the first martyrs. Let those who now call themselves Anglicans—that is, those who profess to "hold all Catholic doctrine," while denying its corner-stone, Papal Supremacy—remember that the wild Protestantism of the reign of Queen Elizabeth followed immediately on the rejection of the Pope's authority. This is not the place in which to trace the full narrative of all the horrors of the persecution by Elizabeth, yet it may be well to allude briefly to a few points in illustration of the *spirit* of the apostasy.

It was in 1535 that the Parliament of Henry the Eighth enacted that "the King's Highness be Supreme Head on Earth of the Church of England," and further, that "if any one, after the first day of February next, do maliciously wish, desire, . . . to deprive the King, the Queen, . . . of their dignity, . . . every such person shall be adjudged a traitor." And it was the Parliament of 1586 that made it treason to be in England after having been made priest by Roman authority; made it felony, punishable with death, to harbor a priest; made it treason to have asked for or to have received, from a Catholic priest, any one of the seven Sacraments, or an Absolution; made it felony to be in possession of an Agnus Dei; and felony to show even any personal consideration for any priest who had received his Orders from Rome. Thus Thomas Bosgrave was hanged because he had put his own hat on a priest's head, the priest having lost his own hat during his arrest. Swithen Wells was hanged because, during his absence from his own house, a priest had said Mass within its walls. A layman in Yorkshire had given a priest a pot of ale, and that crime brought him immediately to the gallows. Marmaduke Bowes, though he had "conformed" to the new religion, was hanged at York for wishing to say a friendly word on behalf of a good priest who had been arrested. And so malignant was this spirit of persecution against the very name, office, or look of a priest, that many gentlewomen of rank were sent to the gallows for their kindly, feminine charity to priests in trouble. Margaret Clitheroe, the glorious martyr of York; Margaret Ward, a gentlewoman of London; the Countess of Salisbury, mother of Cardinal Pole, with many others whose memories are sacred, suffered the worst penalties of the law for their loyalty to the priesthood, which was all one with their loyalty to Catholic doctrines. Just as Sir Thomas More, first the Speaker of the House of Commons, and afterwards Lord High Chancellor of England, was executed by the brutal Henry for his Catholic loyalty, so gentlemen and gentlewomen were executed by the brutal Elizabeth for the crime of not accepting her new religion. Bridgewater, in his "Concertatio," prints a list of twelve hundred names of English priests, religious, and laity, noblemen and gentlemen, and noble women also, who suffered fine and imprisonment before 1588—that is, before the worst part of the persecution. Such awful facts (and it is quite needless to prolong the details) fully justify the assertion that the denial of the Pope's Supremacy was the same thing with the new birth of all heresies; and that the martyrs of Queen Elizabeth were the vindicators of Henry the Eighth's martyrs—who knew that "in the Papal Supremacy lay all truth."

To put it briefly: Within forty years of the rejection of Papal

Supremacy, a miserable "Service" had been substituted for Holy Mass; vile tables were stuck up in place of altars; white-tied laymen took the place of Catholic priests; the seven Sacraments were cut down to two, and of those two the one was made "a sign of regeneration," and the other "a remembrance of the Lord's Supper;" churches were reduced to barns, *minus* their store; priests had to give place to a connubial gentry, and bishops to obedient designates of the ferocious Queen; religion had to make room for an arid mockery; and so impossible was it found to fill the churches that Catholics were fined five pounds for their first offence in not attending, a still larger sum for their second offence, with imprisonment or exportation for the third. And this state of things continued, in its main outline, down to the time of the Catholic Emancipation; indeed, so far as religion was concerned, the English Religion, in the year 1840, was very much what it was in 1580. But then arose, in 1840—at the time of the Oxford movement—a new voice from within which shook "the Church;" to be quickly followed, on the one part by numerous "secessions to Rome," and on the other part by an imitation of Catholic functions. This imitation has now become stereotyped; so that England has settled down to the sham. It is just here that we revert to the original subject as to "the fitness of the time for the beatification," for, though it were presumptuous to inquire into the secret purposes of God, it is permitted to try to appreciate the "fitness."

Anglicans naturally say to us: "Oh, but these days are not the past days; nobody wants to butcher anybody for his religion; Henry the Eighth was a tyrant, simply devoured by his passions; and Elizabeth was no better than she should be. *We* hold all Catholic doctrine, and even allow a certain priority to the Bishop of Rome. We only differ from *you* in that we do not make the Pope infallible, and that we think the primitive Church was more Apostolic than is your Church."

We should reply: Mark the attitude, the intellectual and spiritual attitude, of the Catholic martyrs of both Henry and Elizabeth. *They* were the heirs of at least fifteen centuries of the Catholic faith, spirit, and practice. *They* apprehended, by their deep Catholic spirit, that any one who rejected the Papal Supremacy necessarily made himself his own pontiff; so that, henceforth, no matter what he might believe, he believed *himself*, obeyed himself, as the supreme authority. Whether such a one's private opinions led him to think that *a* Christian doctrine was more or less Scriptural or primitive than a different doctrine; or that the Anglican clergy were more or less true priests or deacons than the Presbyterian, the Greek-orthodox, or the Wesleyan clergy;

the "heresy" of his opinions remained precisely the same, because his opinions were but opinions *without* obedience. The fact that he was cut off from communion with the Holy See, set him adrift on the wide sea of speculation, so that henceforth his own reading, his own judgment, his own bias, must be his sole final arbiter in matters of faith. His "Church," whether it were Queen Elizabeth's, or John Knox's, or John Wesley's, or the Tsar of Russia's, was simply in the same position with himself in its sectarian, arbitrary opinionativeness and speculation. Heresy was in the schismatic *choice* of a Christian creed. So that no matter whether, say, the Church of England be now three centuries old—or, as it was in 1586, "just come of age"—heresy must be its spirit, its evil genius; and all who belong to it—or who did belong to it—must be in the state of heresy and schism.

This seems to be a primary lesson in that "fitness of the time" which is now chosen for the beatification of the English martyrs. Englishmen are so accustomed to the idea of historic heresy that they fancy that three centuries must have sanctified it. The heresy which was begun in the sixteenth century must have worn itself into national orthodoxy in the nineteenth. Besides, have not the Ritualists settled down quietly to the heirship of a good many (almost all) of the Catholic Roman doctrines, so that even if Queen Elizabeth did make a new Church, the Ritualists have practically ignored it, and have gone back to the general tone and general compass of the ideas which were prevalent in earlier centuries. And surely such general tone and general compass must be sufficient for all Catholic purposes, especially when they are supplemented by the assumption of a Catholic priesthood, and by the imitation of Catholic Mass and Catholic functions. Such is the mental attitude of the Ritualists. And this attitude is the very kernel of their heresy. Henry the Eighth believed *most* Catholic doctrines when he sent Fisher and More to the scaffold; but Fisher and More knew that *all* Catholic obedience, together with the whole spirit of the Catholic faith, were included in the one article, authority. If doctrine without authority could be Catholic, then Dissenters might fairly claim to be Catholics, for they hold *some* Catholic doctrines, and they also scoff at the Ritualists for their new Catholicity (just discovered after three centuries of oblivion); for their positively ludicrous affectation of infallibility and œcumenicity, *plus* their supreme interior obedience to themselves. "Your Catholicism," say the Dissenters to the Ritualists, "is an individualized infallibility and œcumenicity, mantled by the pretext of an English National Church, which you are now pleased to affirm to be Catholic, but which was created solely to destroy altars, priesthood, sacrifice." And the Dissenters simply speak the

honest truth. They might go on—indeed, they do go on—to say to the Ritualists: “That obedience to the Supreme Pontiff is the one test of real Catholicity (as distinct from your modern sham or imitation), was the truth for which Fisher and More died; and they would have told *you*,—could they have anticipated your existence—that the want of that obedience made you heretics and schismatics quite as much as it involved such ruin on ourselves.”

To sum up in a word what has been said: The present time seems most fitting for the beatification of the English martyrs, principally for such reasons as the following: (1) The religious and social ease of English Catholics render them liable to forget those far-off days when to confess the Catholic religion involved the risk of being murdered, and the certainty of being banned as a suspected person. (2) The present attitude of the Protestant mind being rather freethinking than protesting, it is as difficult for Catholics to act as missionaries to Protestants as for Protestants to be in earnest about Christian doctrine; hence *both* need the reminder which is now given. (3) The present attitude of the Ritualists involves three separate fallacies, each of which needs to be rudely shaken out of them: that their acceptance of *some* truths makes them confessors of *all* truths; that schism is *not* in being cut off from the Holy See; that heresy is *not* in choosing what we will believe. (4) The present attitude of English skeptics—the more or less educated classes—is an insensibility to the terrible abyss of No-Religion, an insensibility which should make them unhappy at the contrast between themselves and the brave martyrs who gave their lives for Divine Authority. (5) The political attitude of the Catholic Powers needs to be shamed into a better loyalty, not only for their own sake, and for Catholics’ sake, but for the sake of the Protestant Powers, and of all Protestants. (6) The heritage of three centuries of English heresies—of every heresy that was ever imagined by any heretic—culminating in (1) Ritualism, (2) freethinking, (3) political infamy [this last, a world-wide development of English Protestantism], should make the present paternal call of the Holy See to reunion with Catholic faith, Catholic instinct, most appropriate and beneficent to *that* country from which, chiefly, sprang the beginning of all the evil.

Merely suggestive as are these reflections, they are such as have been hazarded by not a few of the Catholic journals of (remaining) Christendom; and such as might be put into better synthesis or compass, by any of the English Catholic authorities.

LEO XIII. AND THE SEPTENNATE.

ON the third and on the twenty-first of last January the late Cardinal Jacobini, Secretary of State to Leo XIII., wrote to the Papal nuncio at Munich requesting him to advise and urge the "Centre" or Catholic party in the Reichstag to vote for Bismarck's measure to free the German army from parliamentary control for seven years. The "Centre," which, led by the skilful Windthorst, had gallantly borne the brunt of battle against the May laws, and finally succeeded in effecting their modification; the "Centre," which had stood so long like a wall against the attacks of the iron-willed chancellor on the liberties of the Church and of the subject, sulked at the Papal interference, but gave to the Pope's request a respectful hearing and a partial obedience. The obedience, however, was sufficient to give Bismarck a parliamentary majority. Thus, through the help of a Pope whose aid he had solicited, the Protestant chancellor wins a victory. Fighting the Pope and the Church, he suffered defeat; with them he conquers his enemies.

It did indeed put the Catholic loyalty of the "Centre" to the test, to be thus thwarted in the full tide of victory by the interference of the Holy Father, for whose interests they had fought with consummate skill under the leadership of a statesman not unequal to the great chancellor himself in adroitness and diplomacy, and his superior in coolness in debate and logical power. Human nature is strong even in those who fight for the Church, and we can easily pardon the "Centre" for entertaining a feeling of satisfaction at the discomfiture of their enemy, and for their unwillingness to forgive him or trust his promises. Perhaps an element of vindictiveness had naturally crept into their hearts when they saw him in distress, a suppliant at the feet of the power which he had long sought in vain to destroy. They remembered the expelled religious orders, the exiled bishops, the imprisoned priests, and all the odious details of the Falk legislation. Windthorst, too, had other reasons for unfriendliness to Bismarckian policy. The "sage of Meppen" remembered the sad fortunes of his dethroned and exiled sovereign, the ex-King of Hanover, all due to Prussian ambition, and the prejudices of the Hanoverian and the "particularist" blended with the feelings of the outraged Catholic in making Windthorst reluctant to give any help or show any quarter to the chancellor. Leo XIII. knew these feelings and

respected them; but he saw farther and he knew more than those who fought surrounded by the smoke of battle. The Pope could trust the loyalty of his sons even when he only urged but did not command them to suppress their prejudices in obedience to his better insight and more perfect knowledge. He was seated on a hill whose summit the smoke of battle could not obscure. He saw the armies ranged on the plain below. He knew the generals. He knew that as commander-in-chief of all the faithful he must protect all their interests, assailed as they continually are from all quarters. If by sacrificing the feelings of one part of the flock he could benefit the rest, or gain greater advantage for the whole, it was his duty to do it. A true general often yields an unnecessary outpost in order to concentrate on a more important strategic point. Bismarck had asked his help. Bismarck that had outmanœuvred Napoleon III. in diplomacy and beaten him disgracefully on the field of battle; the great chancellor who after defeating both Austria and France, the foreign foes of his project, and conquered all his domestic enemies, had welded a new empire together, reorganized its political and social condition, and made it the greatest political power in Europe, came a suppliant to the only foe he could never subdue. He paid to Leo XIII. the homage which one great mind pays to another; and not being able to conquer so powerful an adversary, Bismarck asked to become his friend. What was the Pope to do? The suppliant is a Protestant of the Protestants, who, by consenting to modify legislation contrary to the Church, has given signs of sincere regret. If the Pope interferes, France may be offended. But what is France? A so-called Catholic power showing hostility to the Church and her institutions; France, that permitted her rulers to connive at the stealing of the Papal territory, and has done nothing so far to help towards its restoration. Why should Leo consult the prejudices of France, to which he owes nothing but the almost unendurable position of his office—a position which is a legacy of the perfidy of the last of the Napoleons and of French diplomacy? But in fact Leo's interference was friendly to the best interests of France. He probably saved her from the horrors of war, a war, too, in which she would likely be the chief sufferer, losing another portion of her territory and being obliged to pay a new indemnity. For although France has recovered much of the power which she lost in the late conflict with Germany, she is not yet probably a match for her adversary. The Jacobini letters are the best exponents of the Pope's action, and they give as one of the reasons for it this very purpose of the Holy Father to prevent the war "to the knife" which Bismarck threatened as a consequence of the final rejection of the Septennate bill.

"If the Centre should by its aid to this measure prevent the danger of a near war," writes the Cardinal, "it will have deserved well of the fatherland, of humanity, and of Europe." Perhaps those who have most reason to thank the Pope for his interference are the French people themselves, and especially the inhabitants of the conquered provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, which, being the border land, would suffer most from its miseries and horrors.

The other reasons given in the letters fully justify Leo's fatherly and benevolent interference. A further revision of the Church laws is expected; the odium which would fall on the Church from the unpatriotic opposition of the "Centre" to the bill; the friendly spirit to the Church likely to be engendered by the "Centre's" aid; and the gratitude of the government to the Church party for its assistance, and especially the advantages to be derived by the Holy See from the friendship of the greatest power in Europe; all these considerations explain the Pope's conduct and justify the prudence and wisdom of his advice to the Catholics of Germany. If they did not all follow it, they are excused by the fact that the Pope gave no command and that the passions and prejudices of human nature are often stronger than the counsels of wisdom or the dictates of prudence.

But is there any reason for the attacks made by some writers on the Holy Father's action on the ground that it was an interference beyond the limits of his jurisdiction, and that he has no right to meddle with politics or political questions? The second letter of Cardinal Jacobini shows that with a question of this kind there are often connected questions of "a religious and moral bearing," and that where such is the case, or the interests of the Church are at stake, an interference of the Pope not only becomes justifiable, but necessary; for no one will deny that it is the office of the Holy See to look after the welfare of the Church, and no one can deny that such welfare is often promoted by means and objects pertaining to the temporal order.

That the relation of politics to the Church and the interference of the Pope in this Septennate measure may be more fully explained, let us examine the law and the precedents which justify the Jacobini letters.

The Church is a spiritual society composed of men, that is, of beings having bodies as well as souls, and consequently requiring the use of temporal as well as of spiritual means to attain the end for which it was established. The Church is the continuation of the mystery of the Incarnation, a mystery which means the personal union of two natures, the one human, consisting of a human soul and a human body, the other divine, in one divine person, the common centre of imputability. As the human body of Christ

required temporal things and used them, so does the body of the Church require and use them in the carrying out of her divine mission; and to all such temporal things as are necessary or useful in her work she has a right which no political power should gainsay. The Pope as head of the Church has all the rights which the Church has. He is her infallible mouthpiece in matters of faith and morals. He is the supreme lawgiver, guide, governor and ruler in all matters of faith, morals and discipline. He has the fulness of apostolical power. He is the supreme executive and judge in all matters affecting the conscience or the welfare of the members of the Church. There is no limit to his jurisdiction save what has been put by Christ himself, whose vicar and vicegerent on earth he is. The proper relation, therefore, of a thoroughly Catholic state to the Pope is one of respect and subordination in all things not exclusively of the political order. No law or ordinance or custom of a Catholic state should collide with a Church law. As John, Archbishop of Canterbury, expressed it in a letter to Edward, the King of England, A. D. 1281: "Paying attention to these things, the Catholic emperors subordinated all their laws to the holy canons of the Church, lest they should be deemed heretics or schismatics. Since, therefore, most illustrious king, the peace of the kingdom is in your keeping, you are bound to make your laws accord with the Church canons and abolish those that are contrary to them."¹ However, only in a rhetorical sense could John mean that all the Catholic emperors made their laws accord with the canons. Political ambition and avarice were nearly as strong with the old Catholic emperors as with the modern czars and kaisers. Few of them fully obeyed the laws of the Church, and the conflicts of the Popes with them for centuries were caused by flagrant violations of canon law and infringement of ecclesiastical right by the purple-robed secular sons of the Church. The Archbishop states what should be by right, rather than what was the case in fact, except in a few instances. The right of the Papacy, however, to interfere in temporals when the welfare of the Church required it, has been always asserted by the successors of St. Peter. Mixed questions continually arose in the old Catholic times, the emperor ordering one thing and the Pope another even when the public law of Europe recognized him as the supreme arbiter and judge of Christendom, not only in religion, but in politics.² Thus the Church allowed all classes to become priests in spite of the law of Marcian forbidding soldiers and public officials from entering the holy ministry. The Church exempted the clergy from certain civil duties

¹ Apud Mansi, *Con.*, tom. 24, p. 426.

² See the Abbé Gosselin's work on the "*Pouvoir du Pape au Moyen Age*."

which the state imposed on them. The Church forbade mixed marriages, which the state allowed. The Church appointed holy-days which the state ignored, even when it was supposed to be Catholic. But the Church never recognized the legality of the state's action in such cases. Bouix ("De Papa," p. 4, sec. 3) gives the names of six Popes before Gregory VII. and twenty-two after him who acted according to the doctrine implied by Pius IX. in the condemnation of the twenty-fourth proposition of the Syllabus regarding the relation of the Church to a Catholic state. "The Church has not the power of using force, nor any temporal power, direct or indirect."

As the members of the Church are not pure spirits, they frequently need material means to obtain their spiritual end and save their souls. The state has no right to deny these means, for it is a subordinate society both in its institution and in its purpose. The Church was founded directly by God. Men founded the state. The Church is supernatural in its origin and purpose; the state is essentially natural and temporal. The Church, indeed, has no jurisdiction, direct or indirect, over material things, which, considered in themselves, relate exclusively to the purposes or aims of civil society without being necessary to the proper end for which the Church has been instituted. Over such things, even when civil society is Catholic, the Church has no control, and has never *motu proprio* assumed any.

An explanation of the celebrated Bull of Boniface VIII., issued A. D. 1302, will more clearly illustrate this question of the right of Papal interference in political questions. In that famous document, so decried by Febronians, Gallicans, Josephists, and courtiers, who hold that the state is superior to the Church, or at least its equal, the Pope distinguishes two powers in the Church—two swords—the one spiritual, the other temporal. The former is to be used by the Church, the latter for her. The former is in the hands of the clergy, the latter in the hands of the civil government, to be used in protecting the interests of religion. "But," says Boniface, "the temporal should be under the spiritual sword, and the temporal authority subordinated to the spiritual." Therefore, if the temporal power does wrong, it is to be judged by the spiritual power; and whoever does not accept this teaching practically holds the Manichean doctrine that there are two principles by which the world is governed, the one good, the other evil. Finally, Boniface says: "We declare, say, define, and pronounce, that every creature is under the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff." But these words are to be explained by the purpose and context of the bull. It was issued against a Catholic king on account of his despotic exactions from his Catholic subjects at a time when the whole

of Europe was Catholic, and when the law of nations recognized the Pope as the supreme judge of Christendom in everything. The bull does not and could not mean that unbaptized persons are subject to Papal jurisdiction, for they are entirely beyond the power of the Church. She says with St. Paul: "For what have I to do to judge them that are without?" (1 Cor. v. 12). As to heretics, especially those who are only materially such, and this is now the condition of most of the Christian sects, although the Church has theoretic jurisdiction over them on account of their baptism, practically she does not and will not use it. Her power is for edification and not for destruction, and as an attempt to bind the non-Catholic sects by Catholic church-laws would do more harm than good, some of the modern Popes, like Benedict XIV., for instance, have especially exempted non-Catholic Christians from the penalties consequent on their non-observance. The meaning of the Bonifacian definition is thus practically narrowed down to the elementary theological statement that every Roman Catholic is bound to obey a legitimate Papal mandate. As this is a natural consequence of belief in the primacy of honor and jurisdiction which the Supreme Pontiff exercises by divine right over the whole Church, there can be no difficulty to a Catholic in its acceptance.

That this jurisdiction of the Popes extends even to temporal matters, has been admitted indirectly by some of the greatest Protestant writers, and by others no longer in sympathy with the doctrines and practices of the Church. Liebnitz¹ wrote: "As to the power of the Church or of an Ecumenical Council in temporal affairs, I believe that we must concede to it an indirect influence on account of the relation which temporal matters may have to the salvation of souls. The Church should also regulate the case of conscience as to whether a law should be obeyed or not. . . . She can forbid her subjects to obey the magistrates in certain cases, and the subjects are then obliged to obey her rather than the civil authority." This is a strong Protestant witness for the doctrine of the Bonifacian bull, *Unam Sanctam*. Döllinger, now, alas! no longer one of us, wrote this strong phrase: "When necessity calls for it, the Pope can do *everything*—of course, with the reservation of observing God's laws."² The great historian merely echoed Bossuet's teaching, or rather the teaching of St. Thomas and St. Augustine. The angelic doctor says: "The secular power is subordinate to the spiritual, inasmuch as it has been subordinated by God, namely in those things which pertain to the salvation of souls."³ St.

¹ Foucher de Careil, Œuvres de Liebnitz. Paris, 1859. Vol. i., p. 264.

² Kirche und Kirchen, pp. 39-40.

³ In lib. ii., sent. d. et quest. ult.

Augustine wrote: "If the procurator orders something which the proconsul forbids, you must obey the proconsul. Again, if the proconsul orders something which the emperor forbids, must you not obey the superior and disobey the inferior authority? And so if the emperor orders one thing and God another, you must obey God rather than the emperor."¹ Such is the subordination of the civil to the spiritual authority.

Undoubtedly the power of the spiritual authority is limited; but the Church and no one else is the judge of the limitation. It is not within the competence of every state or of any individual to set himself up as a judge of the limit of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, any more than it is lawful for every citizen to constitute himself the judge of the state's jurisdiction. Such a principle once admitted would destroy all order in both Church and state. The Church's jurisdiction is limited in the case of an individual by his human nature. She cannot coerce his free will nor compel internal assent to her teaching. As to the state, she needs its protection against the violators of her laws, and therefore she treats it with courteous respect. As a matter of historical research it is certain that the state has encroached more on the jurisdiction of the Church than churchmen have upon the prerogatives of the civil power. The history of the Church is a history of concession and compromise with the state. Her power is moral, the state's is physical; and the state has persecuted and robbed the Church habitually from the beginning of the Christian era. The state's complaint of the Church has been the story of the wolf accusing the lamb of muddying the stream.

Certainly the charge of Papal interference in civil affairs would come with bad grace from any Protestant accuser. The history of the whole Protestant revolt has been one of clerical interference in politics. In every land in which the reformation made progress it was through the incendiary speeches and revolutionary acts of preachers attacking the lawful civil authority. Every one of the reformers was not only a preacher, but a politician, interfering in civil affairs, asserting the right of the clergy to control them, and preaching rebellion against every magistrate who disagreed with them in religion. Not to multiply examples, Knox, in Scotland, promoted political insurrection even against the Protestant Queen Elizabeth, and wrote to the Presbyterians: "Which things"²—the overthrow of the existing authorities of the realm—"after all humble request, if ye cannot attain them with open and solemn protestation of your obedience to be given to the authority in all things not plainly re-

¹ *De Natura Boni*, quoted by Peter Lombard, lib. ii., sent. quest. ult.

² Quoted by Lingard, *Hist. of England*, vol. vi., p. 13. Dolman's edition.

pugning to God, ye lawfully may attempt the extremity, which is to provide whether the authority"—civil—"will consent or not, that Christ's evangel may be truly preached, and his holy sacraments rightly administered unto you and to your brethren, the subjects of that realm. And further ye lawfully may, yea, and thereto are bound, to defend your brethren from prosecution and tyranny, be it against princes or emperors, to the utmost of your power." The doctrine of Knox in this matter is still the teaching of the Scotch kirk. It is a doctrine similar to that which the early abolitionists and William H. Seward, President Lincoln's Secretary of State, called the "higher law," or the reserved rights of the individual conscience in the presence of the law. In our own country what has been the practice and doctrine of the Protestant churches? In the old Puritan commonwealths, so completely did the church dominate the state, that they were rather imitations of the Hebrew theocracy than of Christian communities based on the principle of the independence of each order in its own sphere. The Catholic doctrine of the relation of church to state is epitomized in the words of St. Thomas: "Divine right, which is from grace, does not destroy human right, which is from natural reason."¹ "If," says Leo XIII.,² "the civil power should amicably agree with the sacred power of the Church, there would arise great benefits to both parties. The dignity of the state would be amplified, and, religion being its guide, the state would never be unjust." "Jesus Christ," writes the same pontiff, "has so constituted the Church as to make it distinct from the civil power, so that both powers should be free and untrammelled to manage their own affairs."³ This doctrine never pleased the sects. They mixed up church and state so inextricably that it became hard to tell which was the church and which was the state. They restricted, even the right to vote to church members, and abolished, wherever they had the power, all rights of conscience. A good representative of old-school Protestantism was Oliver Cromwell.

His idea of the rights of conscience is exemplified in an anecdote told of him at the siege of New Ross in Ireland. The Catholic inhabitants, sorely pressed by his army, offered to surrender on one condition, namely, that the right of conscience should be guaranteed to them, the right publicly to profess and practise the Catholic religion. "As to the right of conscience," replied he to the petitioners, "I do not interfere with it. But if you mean by it the right to practise the mummeries of popery, I'll have none of it." By the very nature of the case it is much more

¹ Sum. 2a 2ae, q. 10, a 10.

² Ep. Encyc. Arcanum, 10 Feb., 1880.

³ Idem.

dangerous to civil order to have every man's conscience to judge of what is right and lawful in religion and politics, than to have an external infallible tribunal to decide the question. Although we may concede the power of conscience implied in the words of Cardinal Newman, that it is "the aboriginal vicar of Christ," yet the very epithet he uses, "aboriginal," shows the danger to which this subjective judge of right and wrong is exposed. It is an "aboriginal" and liable to all the wanderings of other "aboriginals" before civilization and fixed laws have tamed them. Conscience is indeed, even in Catholic theology, the subjective judge of the morality of an act; but it is so liable to be clouded by prejudice, warped by passion, blinded by self-interest, distorted by ignorance, that it is unsafe to follow it unless it be enlightened and guided from without. Even the Mormons of our country claim that they follow conscience in the practice of their religious and political system, and claim individual inspiration as their guide. Hence we have the "doubtful" conscience, the "scrupulous" conscience, the "lax" conscience, the false conscience, and the "erroneous" conscience about which our moralists write as a proof of the varieties of the species. Every form of error and vice has been justified on the score of "conscience." Rebellion in the Church and state, interference with the rights of others, the destruction of constitutional law, order and peace are justified by appeals to conscience. The communists who want to rob their neighbors of their property, and the anarchists who want to destroy civilization, claim that they are following their "conscience." Perhaps they are; but if so, it only proves more forcibly that conscience requires an external guide to prevent its going astray; and an infallible central external authority is the only guide that can adequately fulfil this purpose. It is, therefore, undoubtedly to the interest of vested rights, of established constitutions, of law and of property, that the consciences of men should recognize such a guide, and obey its orders rather than their own frequently false lights. It is better for the state to be protected by the authority of such a power over conscience than to be exposed at any moment to the revolt of the individual conscience claiming a right which may have no other foundation than imagination, passion or insanity.

Thus, then, as in the Protestant state there is no external guide or rule which the individual conscience is bound to follow, there is no *de jure* security in it against the aberrations of "conscience." In states that recognize Papal authority it becomes the judicial conscience of the people. It is external and impartial, and certain to be unbiassed by passion. It has power even beyond the limits of its infallibility. For although the Pope is infallible only in questions of faith and morals, he legislates and rules beyond these

limits. The decree of the Council of Florence declaring his power of governing and ruling by divine right over the whole Church, implies the duty of conscience on the part of his subjects to obey not only in matters of faith and morals, but in everything comprised within the limits of his universal jurisdiction. To say that because something is not of faith, or does not pertain to the moral order, we may refuse to accept it, is to show gross ignorance of the extent of Papal authority and Catholic duty. The Pope is the superior of the whole Church. Many of his commands concern things that never can be matters of faith. They may be matters of discipline; they may be matters affecting directly only the temporalities of the Church, yet Catholics are bound to obey them by the Fourth of the Ten Commandments, even if there were not additional legislation on the subject.

Very seldom, in recent times especially, have the Popes interfered in purely secular affairs; in the Middle Ages the Church never so tried to dominate the state as the Protestant sects have since done. If the Catholic state in ancient times seconded ecclesiastical legislation, it was most frequently by the voluntary act of the state without ecclesiastical dictation. Charlemagne and Pepin attached civil penalties to ecclesiastical censures by their own volition. By the common law of England an excommunicated person was incapable of being a witness or of bringing an action; and he might be detained in prison until he obtained absolution.¹ Not the Popes, but the piety and the good statesmanship of the princes or of the people, enacted these laws. In the internal political dissensions of the Italian cities the Popes often interfered, but generally by request of the contesting parties. The same is true of much of the Papal interference in the civil dissensions of the kingdoms beyond the Alps. The interference of the Popes in Germany in the Middle Ages was by right, for the Holy Roman Emperors were vassals of the Holy See, which conferred on them their title and their crown.

But the Popes interfered by right also even when not solicited to do so by the civil power. Gregory II., who gets the credit from some writers of having detached Italy from the Eastern Empire, wrote to Leo the Isaurian, in the eighth century, claiming the right to arbitrate between the East and the West. His words are given by Labbe²: "The Roman Pontiffs are the arbiters and moderators of peace between West and East. . . . The eyes of the nations are fixed on our humility, and they regard us as a God on earth." How much misery and bloodshed the nations would have been

¹ Hallam's *Middle Ages*, p. 275. New York. Harper. 1837.

² V. viii., col. 19 and 22.

spared had they continued so to regard the Popes, and thus settled by arbitration the quarrels of princes!

In the year 863, Pope Nicholas I. wrote to Adventius, Bishop of Metz, regarding King Lothaire, of Lorraine, and Queen Thetberga: "See whether these kings and princes, to whom you say you are subject, are really kings and princes; whether they conduct themselves well, rule well the peoples confided to them, and govern according to law. If such is not the case, they are not kings, but tyrants; and we must arm against them, instead of obeying them."¹ This is a direct interference in politics in favor of the people. The Popes and the clergy, indeed, were their only protectors against kings and nobles in those days. Mark also the date of this Papal letter, written long before the period of Papal political aggrandizement.

Innocent III., one of the most illustrious of the Pontiffs, used political influence all over the civilized world to benefit the cause of Christianity. For that purpose he made a new empire in the East, humbled haughty Philip Augustus, of France, created a German emperor, punished King John, of England, and combined the whole of Christendom against Mussulman Asia.

The benefits of Papal interference in politics in the interests of peace and popular liberty were, however, at length checked by the revolutionary decrees of the Council of Basel and the rise of Protestantism. When the Pope lost his political power the people lost their best friend. The "Reformers" made the princes despots by destroying the power of the Pope and of the bishops. The growth of modern political despotism dates from the sixteenth century, when the Pope's temporal power was weakened.

The case of Alexander VI., drawing "a line of demarcation" over the map of America, to prevent quarrels between the Spaniards and the Portuguese, is a good precedent for the action of Leo XIII. deciding the dispute between Germany and Spain in the matter of the Caroline Islands.

Leo could find, even in the history of England, many instances of Papal interference in politics for the benefit of the people, if precedent be needed for what is a matter of absolute right. In the year of our Lord 806 the English insurgents against King Eardulf committed their cause to the decision of Pope Leo III;² and the Pontiff excommunicated the king, very much to the satisfaction of his Kentish subjects. The oldest treaty now on record made by an English king with a foreign power, was arranged by Pope John XV., A.D. 1002, and drawn up in his name.³

¹ Labbe, v., viii., Concil., Ep. iv.

² Lingard's England, vol. i., p. 112.

³ Idem, p. 241.

As to the political influence of the Pope who excommunicated Henry II. for murdering Becket, we have the testimony of the arch-enemy of Christianity, Voltaire, to its beneficent results. He says : " The man who, in the Middle Ages, deserved perhaps the highest tribute from the human race, was Pope Alexander III. He it was who, in a council held in the twelfth century, abolished as far as lay in his power the curse of slavery. It was he, again, who, in Venice, triumphed by his prudence over the violence of the Emperor Barbarossa. He restored the rights of nations and curbed the passions of kings. Before his time all Europe, save a small number of cities, was divided into two classes of men : the lords of the land, ecclesiastic and lay, and the slaves. If men have recovered their rights, it is chiefly to Pope Alexander that they are indebted for it ; to him so many cities owe their new or recovered splendor."¹

Boniface VIII. specifies in the bull *Ausculda fili* his reasons for punishing Philip the Fair of France, because " of admitting no judgment but his own, either within or without his kingdom, on the unjust and violent acts committed in his name ; of his abasement of the currency ; and of loading his subjects with intolerable burdens." Certainly such interference was beneficial to the people, and justified by the office of the Pope as spiritual father of all Christians. In a community in which has recently died a great Protestant preacher,² who won his popularity by attacking from the pulpit the political institution of slavery in our land ; in a community in which words of praise are bestowed on another Protestant divine,³ who has used all his spiritual influence to have a bill passed to regulate the liquor traffic, no fault can consistently be found with Leo XIII. for interfering by request in a matter that concerned the happiness of Germany and France, and the peace and welfare of the world.

Leo XIII. has only done, in a grander field, what is daily done by every priest in his parish. The curate of the smallest village is continually employed in settling family disputes, sometimes without being invited to do so. It is his duty to use his spiritual office for the preservation of peace in the community. His Protestant neighbor often invokes his aid in a dispute with a Catholic neighbor or servant, and the priest's influence in such cases is always respected and nearly always efficient in good results. Why, then, censure a Pontiff for doing that which is claimed as lawful by every minister of the Gospel in his dealings with his flock ?

The Pope's action was beneficent, and the old Protestant emperor has already publicly expressed his thanks. May we not hope to

¹ Apud Darras' Ch. Hist., vol. iii., p. 270.

² Beecher.

³ Dr. Crosby and " high license."

see this interference of Leo in the dispute about the Caroline Islands and in the Septennate inaugurate new precedents for the re-establishment of the Roman Pontiffs in their old position of supreme arbiters between nations? Protestant bigotry is dying out in Europe, and the people are groaning under the burdens of oppressive taxes rendered necessary by the hostile feelings of separate nationalities. War threatens on all sides. There is no arbiter but the sword, and the people are robbed to sustain it. Statistics show that it costs Russia annually one billion one hundred and sixty-two millions of francs to keep up her military establishment. The ratios of the military tax of the chief nations of Europe, even in peace, are as follows :

	Francs.
Russia,	1,162,000,000
France,	850,000,000
Great Britain and her dependencies,	792,664,866
Germany,	570,332,215
Austria,	338,139,416
Italy,	302,901,306

The people pay these taxes, while at the same time their best manhood is forced into the army, there to be demoralized in peace or slaughtered in war. Not one of these nations dares take the initiative of disarmament. They are all afraid and suspicious of one another. How much better for the people and the princes, therefore, to recognize in the spiritual head of Christianity a supreme judge and arbiter in all disputes! If the civil powers would pledge obedience to his decisions, with a further pledge to enforce them against a recalcitrant, the armies might be disbanded, conscriptions would be unnecessary, universal peace, comfort, and happiness would be the result. Leo XIII. has shown the way to settle disputes without bloodshed. If princes and peoples will follow it, posterity will bless his memory.

LAND AND LABOR.

WITHIN these last few years the question of private ownership in land has been brought, in a controversial spirit, before the public mind. Formerly it seemed to be considered by all as not being a debatable topic, but now, in consequence of the hardships coupled with land-tenure in some countries, it has become quite prominent, and is discussed in the press, in books, and in public lectures. Sides are taken, and those in favor of this novel theory pronounce all private land ownership to be untenable, on the grounds of natural law and justice. Certainly, to say the least, it looks strange, at first sight, that a usage which has been universal among nations, should be brought into court at this late hour in the world's history, and be charged with a violation of eternal justice.

In the study of this question it will, perhaps, help us not a little to have a definite idea of the right of property. By the common sense of the human race, it is taken to mean the right of freely possessing and of disposing of, as useful and truly one's own, material, external things. The primary idea of property, then, implies individual ownership, to the exclusion of the rights of others, and also involves the right of using or disposing of one's goods after the manner he shall judge best. Ownership may, indeed, have certain liens on it; to it may be attached the fulfilment of certain conditions, the specification by contract of its duration; but even in such cases ownership gives to man, for the time being, the full control of his possession. This idea of ownership, being in keeping with the dictates of human reason, did not set men a-thinking about its origin, and much less about its lawfulness; they no more thought of questioning their general right of possessing property than they did their right of eating their meals. But as some persons have undertaken to unhinge the common order of things, and to dispute the right of ownership, what was before a practice has now to be studied in its principle, and the common actions of men have to be read back into their motives. Taken in its most absolute sense, and as the result of creative action, ownership in land, as to its nature and use, belongs to God alone. He is the creator of heaven and earth, and, as such, has unconditioned dominion and absolute ownership of all things. "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and all things that dwell therein." About this point there is no ques-

tion ; it is on man's right to hold private property in land that the whole contention turns. And first, we remark that whatever right to land man possesses, it must be a derived right, one granted by his Maker to him for the object and furtherance of his existence ; one, moreover, which can be verified in the original deed of grant, and which is to hold for all time and among all peoples. That deed, given in the preamble of the act of creation, is couched in these words : " Let us make man to our image and likeness, and let him have dominion over the fishes of the sea and the fowls of the air and the beasts and the whole earth and every creeping creature that moveth on the earth ! " After the creation of Adam God gives to him this deed of universal dominion, and in him, as the representative head of the human family, he gives the same deed to all mankind. " The earth He has given to the children of men. " To them all material goods have been subjected, that they may possess and use them for their support in conformity with the divine will. Of their own nature and by the divine grant those free goods are not this one's more than another's ; they are actually undetermined in relation to proprietorship, but may become in part by the activity of individuals, the private property of this or that, person. They thus become the substance out of which property is formed, but, by themselves in any determinate form, they give no right to ownership of them. That right is acquired by activity on man's part.

Considered as a race, or as the descendants of Adam, the earth is men's general patrimony. They have the abstract general capacity to own it, just as they have the abstract general capacity to own the fishes of the sea and the birds of the air. This capacity, which exists faculty-like in them, gives merely power to own land, much after the manner in which the faculty of mind gives power to own science. By the general deed of the divine grant, then, the earth in its substance was put under man's dominion ; it was to be his home in this world, and with its products he was to support life. The native right which he has to the means wherewith to provide for his physical and social needs founds his right to proprietorship in general. His right to live postulates his right to the means thereunto. Life, to be sure, man may support by the transitory use of things. But, for all men, to live from hand to mouth, or not to know to-day how they are to live on the morrow, is neither according to the due order of nature, nor according to the requirements of settled civilized society. By the transitory use of things, some of them, such as food, are consumed in that very use ; many others, when utilized by one, exclude the use of them by another ; two men at the same time and for different ends cannot use the same spade in digging, nor the same saw in sawing ;

or, if we suppose that some things can be used simultaneously by many, many must also be necessarily excluded, at least from the passing use of them.

A transitory use of things, therefore, does not, according to the divine dispensation, suffice to satisfy the requirements of man's nature. The dominion over all things which he has received from his Maker, implies that he has the right and the freedom to use them in the way that will best answer to his needs. Amid the changes around him, stability of proprietorship is that which he finds will go to secure to him the necessities of life, and will correspond best with his natural and social wants, and therefore it is that, in the exercise of his rational liberty and judgment, he claims the right of stable ownership. This conflicts not with God's absolute dominion, but only excludes the dominion of others; neither is it at variance with the nature of material things, since these have been put by God at man's disposal, and become more useful by the undisturbed possession of them. On the other hand, a permanent property in things is called for by man's continual wants; it furnishes him with the means of providing safely for his sustenance; it gives him a home and employment, and partly secures him against the many miseries incident to human existence. Through it old age and bodily infirmity can look for succor, and when the storm rages and the winter's cold congeals all nature, or when the sun with tropical heat burns up the earth, or the plague blights the growing crop, man's permanent home is for him his refuge, and the stores which he has laid up become the rewards of his industry. The protection which stability of tenure gives becomes thus the great stimulus to labor—the source also of contentment, while by the gains which it insures, it promotes the study and application of the arts—liberal, industrial, and mechanical. According to these principles, at all times, and everywhere, the human race has acted; men have considered the division of property and the permanent possession of land or houses or chattels to be conformable to the dictates of justice and the prescriptions of the natural law.

Hitherto we have discussed only the general right to proprietorship; now we have to examine what the nature of that right is. Is it an individual or a collective right? Can men as individuals hold private ownership in land, or is it only the community that can hold that ownership? In the premises I have to note that, as individuals, men have an undeniable right to the ownership of that which they justly procure for the relief of their immediate wants,—for instance, to the food which they need or to the clothes which they wear. As to this transitory use of things, man's right is undisputed. It is only against his stable ownership in land that objections have been raised. Our previous inquiry has shown us

that, to provide for his wants, man has the inborn right to stable ownership in property, be it land or houses or chattels; a thesis which necessarily supposes that man's right in the case is a personal right, since what is in a man by nature is necessarily personal, and belongs to him independently of all others. This right, grounded on man's activity as a free agent and on his power of bettering himself, is innate in him as an essentially independent personal being. His necessities are his own personally, and consequently his right to provide for these by private ownership of property is and must be his own personal right. Primarily, man is for himself; secondarily, only for society, for by the law of nature personal right precedes communal right. Charity towards himself is to be man's rule and the standard of his charity towards others.

Man, however, is a social being,—destined to live in companionship with his fellow-men. The native right, therefore, which, as a free agent, he possesses of bettering himself he may exercise in union with them. If he so will it, he may merge, for the time being, his individual right to ownership in land in the common right of the village community, in order to become a stockholder in its property, or, in other words, he may unite his own innate right to ownership, if he judge fit, with the rights of those with whom he is socially united for the purpose of securing a better livelihood. Such a system of land-tenure, we are told, still exists in India? "The rights of the landlords," writes Mountstuart Elphinstone, "are theirs collectively, and though they have more or less perfect partition of them, they never have an entire separation. A landholder, for instance, can sell or mortgage his rights; but he must first have the consent of the village, and the purchaser steps exactly into his place and takes up all his obligations. If a family becomes extinct, its share returns to the common stock."¹ Here, then, even under this form of collective ownership in land, we find it recognized that any landlord may sell or mortgage his share, and thus exercise his original right of returning to individual ownership in property.

That man has an individual right to possess landed property as his own is evident, we think, from the proofs given. But how is that right to be determined? or, on what title can a man claim that this or that portion of land, formerly unoccupied, is his? Men, of course, acquire just titles to land by purchase, by contract, by inheritance; of this secondary mode of acquiring land we do not speak here. Our present thesis turns on the original, primitive method of acquiring ownership in free land. By itself, neither nature nor reason defines what parts of that land or what spontaneous products of nature are man's property. The determina-

¹ Quoted by Henry Sumner Maine, in his work, "Ancient Law." Page 255.

tion of that has been left to man himself by his Maker, when He gave to him dominion over the earth and all things therein. Material goods are at man's service; he is to use them as means wherewith to fulfil his destiny, and he can, therefore, in some legitimate way, make them his own. Movable things, it is readily admitted, become his by just possession, the result of his industry; and, after a similar manner, immovable goods and land, and consequently the principal of them, become his by real, just occupancy, the product in some way of his labor. The legitimate, external possession of unoccupied land is, then, the first element in proprietorship. Through it, coupled with his industry, man makes land to be his own, and that, to the exclusion of all others, specifies his ownership by external acts, and thus reduces the natural capacity that lies in him to hold property to an actual individual right. Universally admitted by men as being in conformity with natural law, the just possession of free land, they considered, gave to one a valid, permanent title to its ownership. They judged that he had as much right to the land which he made his own by his industry as the fisherman had to the fish which he caught in mid-ocean or the hunter to the game which he shot in the public forest. There was no reclamation on the part of the human race against the exercise of this right, because according to the dictates of natural justice there was no wrong in it. Reason did not protest against what was conformable to it. In olden, primitive times one of the laws of the Indian legislator, Manu, expresses the right to ownership in land in the following terms: "The field is the property of him who first reclaimed it, as much as the antelope is the property of the first hunter who shoots it." The same rational nature always dictated that the rights of the parents to their property descend to their children, and that a man can by sale or exchange transfer his title to ownership in land to another, as he can his title to any movable property.

At present it is on the determination of the title to ownership that the whole controversy depends. It is not the just occupancy of anything, it is said, which specifies a title to it, but the production of it,—that only is man's own which he makes. This major premise is, we feel, too broad for the argument raised upon it. Let one hold that it is only the production of a thing that originates a just title to it, and directly he finds that he has no logical grounds to rest on. He has not produced land, indeed, but neither has he produced the raw materials out of which his coat and shoes, his house and watch have been wrought. Still, he steadfastly maintains that he has ownership in these, and that to deprive him of them would be downright robbery. Thus his major premise gives way, refutes itself, and he is "hoist with his own petard." Besides,

if a person were exacting in his logic he might require a proof of the major, and demand how does one know that man has a right to what he produces? All that man can do with material things is to give to them an artificial form—to make them fructify by his industry. Thus he can make land fruitful by cultivation or by use of one kind or other; thus, too, the sculptor can make the marble productive by his chisel, and the painter, by blending, in due proportion, different material elements, can, according to his art, produce a picture. The form which one gives to the material thing is inseparable from it, so that, for the time being, to possess the one is also necessarily to possess the other.

Still, it is argued that as the earth has been put by God under the dominion of the human race, and as it is expressly said that "the earth He has given to the children of men," so is it the inheritance of all alike; and every one has as good a right to this or that plot of ground as the man who holds it. This method of reasoning ignores the elementary truth that the abstract powers of a corporate body are one thing, and personal, individual right another. When, then, it is said that the earth is given by God to the children of men, there can be question only of their abstract capacity to possess land; but the actual right to this or that portion of it each one must make good by a lawful title. The capacity for possession is quite a different thing from the right of possessing. Let us suppose the theory reduced to practice,—then the man who is in possession of a farm may be excluded by his neighbor, and the latter in turn be excluded by the former, since the rights of both are equal,—and thus everywhere what belongs to all is the property of none. All men, then, are to live on no man's land and are to be governed by robbers' law. Undoubtedly men have a right to the means wherewith to live, and even in cases of extreme want the right to property must yield to the law of necessity. But land is not the only means whereby men may procure a livelihood. Providence has so ordained that in every country there are thousands of ways of procuring a living besides those derived from agriculture or landed possessions. In this country there are very many who live by trading in the products of other lands, and, on the other hand, in other countries there are thousands of their inhabitants who make out a livelihood by utilizing for life purposes the products supplied by America. Hence it comes to pass that the interchange of the goods of various nations enables people to live not exclusively, or even not at all, on the produce of their own country. Man, however, has a natural right to a livelihood in the land of his birth; but that does not imply that he has a right there "to three acres and a cow." He has in his native country a right

to a suitable living, but that he may procure otherwise than by cultivating a farm.

In striving to do away with private ownership in land, some writers have been led to give to the state undue power over landed property. Hobbes and Bentham went directly to the point when they maintained that it is the civil law that originated property. Modern theorists, however, would not say so much, but indirectly they reach the same conclusion. The state, they hold, may so burden land with taxes that virtually it deprives man of ownership in it, since land which is of no profit to the possessor of it, but, on the contrary, entails loss, is not worth possessing. A system of this sort runs counter to what we have shown to be man's inborn natural right to proprietorship in land; it tends to make him to be only, as it were, a spoke in the wheel of state, with no free personal right, with no power of independent action for supporting life and for bettering himself. These rights and powers are, however, the basis of natural equity, and without them natural law and natural justice would be mere words. All this nature dictates, and universal experience has been in conformity with the teaching of nature. Men have always considered that just civil legislation must be in conformity with natural law, and have tested the justice of civil enactments by examining them in the light of natural and eternal equity. A property-law, in the estimation of all peoples, will be good or bad according as it conforms or does not conform to the primary rules of justice that govern property. These antedate all state-power, since this supposes the existence of society, which must be held together by the bonds that spring from property-rights.

The right to private property in land has been along through the ages in the convictions of every people; springing from natural law, it has been always wound up with the workings of natural conscience. Among the people of God it was accepted as a revelation in nature, and as a matter of course, without any questioning whatever, was always acted on. Let a few facts serve to illustrate this thesis:

In the 23d chapter of Genesis occurs the affecting passage of Abraham's purchasing from Ephron, the son of Seor, land for the burying of his deceased wife Sara. "And he (Abraham) spoke to Ephron in the presence of the people; I beseech thee to hear me; I will give money for the field; take it, and so I will bury my dead in it! And Ephron answered: My Lord, hear me; the ground which thou desirest is worth four hundred sicles of silver; this is the price between me and thee; but what is this? bury thy dead. And when Abraham had heard this, he weighed out the money that Ephron had asked, in the hearing of the children of Heth,

four hundred sicles of silver, of common current money. And the field that before was Ephron's, wherein was the double cave looking towards Mambre, both it and the cave, and all the trees thereof, in all the limits round about, was made sure to Abraham for a possession, in the sight of the children of Heth, and of all that went in at the gate of his city."

So sacred were the rights of property in land in the eyes of the Hebrew people that King Achab did not dare to take from Naboth the vineyard which he was unwilling to give up to him. The fact is thus related in the twenty-first chapter of the third Book of Kings:

"And after these things, Naboth the Jezrahelite, who was in Jezrahel, had at that time a vineyard near the palace of Achab, king of Samaria. And Achab spoke to Naboth, saying: 'Give me thy vineyard, that I may make me a garden of herbs, because it is nigh and joining to my house, and I will give thee for it a better vineyard; or if thou think it more convenient for thee, I will give thee the worth of it in money.' Naboth answered him: 'The Lord be merciful to me, and not let me give thee the inheritance of my fathers.' And Achab came into his house angry and fretting because of the word that Naboth the Jezrahelite had spoken to him, saying: 'I will not give thee the inheritance of my fathers.'"

The proof of the thesis is still more strongly confirmed by God's commanding the purchase of land and sanctioning ownership in it by his own express words: Thus in the thirty-second chapter of the prophecy of Jeremias we read: "And Jeremias said: 'The word of the Lord came to me, saying: "Behold! Hanameel, the son of Sellum, thy cousin, shall come to thee, saying: 'Buy thee my field which is in Anatoth, for it is thy right to buy it, being next akin.'" And Hanameel, my uncle's son, came to me, according to the word of the Lord, to the entry of the prison, and said to me: 'Buy my field which is in Anatoth, in the land of Benjamin, for the right of inheritance is thine and thou art next of kin to possess it.' And I understood that this was the word of the Lord. And I bought the field of Hanameel, my uncle's son, that is in Anatoth; and I weighed him the money, seven staters and ten pieces of silver." This deed of purchase, subscribed and sealed publicly, was, as it were, a bond of future possession given to the Jews in their desolation. "For thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: 'Houses and fields and vineyards shall be possessed again in this land.'" The reading of these and similar texts immediately suggests that ownership in land is not given as a new revelation, but is accepted as a law underlying the constitution of the moral world.

Men in due circumstances used and applied that law without any hesitation, and no more questioned the lawfulness of their act

than they did that of walking or of breathing. In this respect what held under the Old Law holds under the New. The moral code has not been changed, but, on the contrary, has been sanctioned and perfected by the teaching of the Gospel. We say "the moral code," since there is a question not of mere political economy, but of commutative justice—the purchase of land involves a contract, and every contract is based on the moral law; or again, ownership in land is, as we have seen, based on right, and right is necessarily of the moral order. As there was no innovation to be introduced into moral doctrines by Christianity, it was not to be expected that Christ should expressly mention practices which needed no correction and which had on them the sanction of divine authority. Private ownership in land, as being approved by natural and revealed law, He found to be a matter of practical universal observance. As He was not, therefore, to legislate specially on the subject, it is only incidentally and as if by side-views that we can gather what His mind was on the subject matter we discuss. These views we find suggested by some of the parables. As familiar narratives wherewith to illustrate His doctrine, Christ took these parables from the incidents of everyday life among the Jews, from what they knew and approved and accepted in their usual manner of living. Thus in the parable of the sowing of the cockle, ownership of his field is given to the husbandman: "The kingdom of heaven is likened to a man who sowed good seed in his field;" and his fellow-men are made to approve of that ownership when they say: "Sir, didst thou not sow good seed in *thy* field?" And again, we read in the parable of the grain of mustard seed, "which a man took and sowed in *his* field." More strikingly still, it is said of Christ by St. Luke, chapters xii. and xiii., that on a certain occasion one of the multitude said to Him: "Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me." But he said to him: "Man, who hath appointed me judge or divider over you?" As if He would have said, your brother's right rests on natural and positive law; it is not my part to divide or to annul it. Then, continuing, He cautions His followers, in the parable of the rich man, against avarice, saying: "The land of a certain rich man brought forth plenty of fruits." He then proceeds to explain how, intent only on hoarding up wealth, and not caring for the obligations that lay on him of giving to the poor, that rich man received unexpectedly the warning: "Thou fool! this night do they require thy soul of thee." What is supposed in our Lord's teaching in regard to the private tenure of land is actually exemplified in the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, in which it is said of the converts to Christianity who wished to embrace evangelical poverty, that "as many as were *owners of lands*

or houses sold them and brought the price of the things they sold and laid it down before the feet of the Apostles, and distribution was made to every one according as he had need. And Joseph, who by the Apostles was surnamed Barnabas (which is by interpretation the son of consolation), a Levite, a Cyprian born, *having land*, sold it and laid it at the feet of the Apostles."

The teaching of Christ in all its influences was given by Him to His Church. She was to be His unerring organ on earth. With her He promised to be through all time and to send to her the Holy Ghost who was to lead her into all truth and to abide with her forever. With the divine assistance granted to her she was to teach infallibly God's revelation—natural and supernatural; to interpret it, to apply it and to be its ever-watchful guardian against all innovation. By formal definition she was to put revealed doctrine into words whenever the interests of truth required it, to draw up creeds for the greater unity and security of belief, and to condemn, in virtue of her divine commission, doctrinal error as being opposed to the faith once delivered to the saints. But it was not merely faith that was entrusted to her keeping, but also morals. She was to be the guardian not only of what men were to believe, but also of what they were to practise; not only of that which was directly, according to revealed law, food for the mind, but also of what, according to natural law, was to be immediately food for the will. The former she was to formalize in definition, the latter she was principally to draw out in practice. In the moral practical principles given for the ruling of the lives of her children, she, by divine appointment, was to see to it that there was nothing contrary to natural justice, nothing contrary to natural law or to the teaching of the Gospel. The propagation of a practice contrary to natural justice the Church could no more sanction than she could the propagation of an error contrary to the divinity of Christ. It is the whole and not a part of God's saving truth that has been confided to her guardianship.

These premises being laid down, a further inquiry is, whether the Church has sanctioned private property in land, and if she has, how and how far? This inquiry, it is plain, involves a question of fact and a question of duty,—the fact is, to wit, the prevalence of private ownership in land, the duty, the obligation of the Church in relation to that fact. As to the first, from the whole domain of Christian history it can be readily gathered that proprietorship in land has been of universal usage. There has not been a Christian people all through the ages among whom private property has not been unhesitatingly admitted. Conditioned variously this proprietorship undoubtedly has been at different epochs; but for all that, proprietorship it has always been acknowledged to be.

This the extant laws of every Christian people put beyond dispute. "Upon this principle," writes Blackstone, "the great charter (Magna Charta) has declared that no freeman shall be disseised, or divested of his freehold, or of his liberties or free customs, but by the judgment of his peers or by the law of the land. And by a variety of ancient statutes it is enacted, that no man's lands or goods shall be seized into the King's hands, against the great charter and the law of the land; and that no man shall be disinherited nor put out of his franchises or freehold, unless he be duly brought to answer and be forejudged by course of law; and if anything be done to the contrary, it shall be redressed and holden for none." The laws of every country specify the obligations attached to the holding of property, the conditions on which it is to be owned, but the right to possess and hold land they never question. In relation to this matter, what we witness in our own age is in keeping with the past. The whole Christian world at present acknowledges private ownership in land, in spite of opinions expressed to the contrary by a few, and of the communistic efforts of such men as Robert Owen in England, of Saint Simon, Fourier, and Enfantin in France, and of Karl Marx in Germany. These men tried to break up or to distort a law of nature, but nature quickly righted itself.

Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret.

The fundamental rights of all private property remain unchanged.

The Church herself as a corporate body has a right to hold property in land as well as in other temporal affairs. Not only that, but this patrimony, be it even in land, she authorizes her ministers to hold even after their promotion to the priesthood. Nay, she sanctions for religious ends the right which they as citizens have of holding landed possessions. The universality, therefore, of the law of private property in land throughout Christendom determines for us in what light the Church views it. Clearly she judges that there is nothing in the principle of that law that would justify her interference, that there is nothing wrong in it, nothing contrary to the principles of Christian morality. We have said that the purchase of land, or that the just, real, and not merely nominal possession of it, founds right, and that right brings the question of private land-tenure within the scope of the moral order.¹ This right, then, we submit, is within the legislative competency and office of the Church as the infallible interpreter and guardian of the moral law. What we say of the Church as a body we say of her

¹ "Political economy is a science which by its very nature is subordinate to moral science."—*Civil. Cattol.*, March 5th, 1887, p. 539.

Supreme Head, the Roman Pontiff, teaching all Christian peoples *ex cathedra*. The principle that underlies the holding of property in land falls within the range of the exercise of his supreme office. That it does so, those who speak on the other side suppose, since they assert that private landed property is against the laws of natural justice. The fact, then, of the universality of private ownership in land and the obligations of the Church as the guardian of the moral code being taken into account, it is evident that by her practice and approbation she holds that the right to real ownership in land, private or public, is in itself lawful and a point of Catholic doctrine.

Surely the natural right to ownership in land has been often cruelly dealt with, and been often set aside or trampled on by armed force. Men, women and children have often been led captives into foreign lands, or reduced to slavery in their native country, or even massacred on the bosom of their mother earth; but for all that, the principle of the right to a living in the land of one's birth did not die with them—men die, but the right lives on.

Coming down through the centuries, the first, studied, elaborate effort to establish a principle of communism in land we find to have been made by Plato in his ideal republic. It was a Utopia he dreamt of, but one most immoral under many respects. Aristotle came afterwards, and turning the full light of his powerful reason on the plan of Plato, examined it in all its parts and consequences, and with that great, strong good sense which characterized him, pronounced it to be a plan repugnant to practical reason and subversive of social order. A state, indeed, he holds, may have some lands common to all, and this principle we find carried out in modern Christian nations. The parks of a city, for instance, are for the benefit of all, but private property, he maintained, is one of the great social bonds of a state,—a great stimulus to industry, and the great preventative of private bickering, of jealousy, and of idleness. It is the business of the legislator, he also suggests, "to create in men" "a benevolent disposition" in the use of their property, a suggestion which leads up to the language of the Apostle when he tells his disciple to command the rich to give of their goods to the poor.

Later on, one of the special characteristics of Roman jurisprudence was its code on private property. The *jus privatum* (or the civil law of individuals) remains one of the greatest works of Roman genius, a work that took twelve hundred years in its construction, and still was cast, as it were, in the same mental mould, and shapen in all details with the greatest logical precision. It grew out of the absolute exclusive notion of personal property; but how that property was acquired, whether justly or unjustly, it

cared not. To the Roman might was right, and ownership implied absolute despotic power over things and persons. This, of course, was a most gross and cruel abuse of the natural right of ownership. It is not this enormous abuse that we consider here, but the acknowledgment, that is coupled with it, of the right to hold private property in land during the era of Roman dominion. In it we find another great link in the chain of human testimony to that right, recognized nearly everywhere, and always, since the formation of civil society. Taken in the gross, then, the human race has invariably judged that man has a strict natural right to hold private ownership in land, both as to the use and as to the thing, in spite of conditions that may have been imposed on that ownership. And what the human race judges to be a natural right must be a true and just right.

What St. Thomas Aquinas teaches on this subject he has expressed in two short *articuli* in his "Theological Summa." In his time the question of private ownership in land was not a practical one. No one thought of claiming that he had as good a right to a farm as the owner of it. Still the theory of communism in land was not unknown to him, as we learn from his references to the "Politics" of Aristotle, in which the land question is specially mentioned. Only incidentally, therefore, in discussing the nature of sins against justice, does St. Thomas propose his doctrine on ownership in property, or, as he has it, "in external things." And principal among these is land.

In his first thesis he examines the origin and nature of man's general abstract right to possess things as his own. His proposition is: "Whether the possession of external things is natural to man?" To this he answers with a distinction—external things may be considered in their nature or their use; if considered in their nature, they are subject only to the divine will, since it is only God, their Creator, who can order or modify that nature or suspend its laws. Hence, to the least expression of His will all nature bows (*cui omnia ad nutum obediunt*). Considered in their use, God has given to man dominion over all external things, and has made him, so to say, lord of creation. The grant of this dominion the Saint derives from the first chapter of the book of Genesis, v. 26, which has been already quoted. This grant implies, first, that man can possess property, no matter of what kind, in cattle or in houses or in land, in virtue of a title given him by God; since, according to the reasoning of Aristotle, whom the Saint cites with approbation, "the possession of external things is natural to man." And secondly, that grant implies that man can utilize those things in accordance with his needs, since he possesses them under God for the ends for which God gave them. Having laid

down these premises on the abstract right of ownership in his first thesis, St. Thomas then proceeds to a second, which he states in these terms: "Is it lawful for a man to possess anything as his own?" which is equivalent to the question: "Is it lawful for a man to hold private property in land?" After his own manner, the Saint examines the thesis in its general bearing on the possession of external things—classifying property again, whether land, houses, or chattels, etc., under one heading. Now, in regard to property so defined, to man naturally belongs, he says, the power of managing, of farming, or of procuring it, as well as the power of distributing or dividing it; and as far as this twofold power goes to constitute possession, man may lawfully have the ownership of things. Then the great doctor goes on to examine the grounds of that power, and finds that it springs from a threefold cause: first, the promotion of industrial economy, since man is naturally more careful of what is his own than of what is common to all,—what is the business of everybody is apt to be looked upon as the duty of no one; second, social order,—let everybody be charged with caring for everything, and utter confusion is sure to ensue; and third, the preservation of social peace, a result which follows "when every one is content with his own property." Man is indeed entitled to make his property fructify by managing and farming it—in this he is independent of others and master of his possessions, but not so in regard to its products or the use of it. He is not a hermit, but a social being, and as such is bound to contribute, in just proportion, to the well-being of the society in which he lives. Social and Christian charity has a *lien* on his property. He is surely not bound to divest himself of all that he possesses, but to give to the poor according to his means. On this point the doctrine of St. Paul is the doctrine of St. Thomas. "Charge the rich of this world," writes the Apostle to his disciple, "not to be high minded nor to trust in the uncertainty of riches, but in the living God (who giveth us abundantly all things to enjoy); to do good, to be rich in good works, to give easily, to communicate to others; to lay up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on the true life." From his resources, no matter what they may be, movable or immovable, man is bound to assist his poorer brethren. Their necessity is a law which he has to observe in the use which he makes of his riches. In this sense it is that the Saint calls the use of external things common, that is, as he explains, "that he (man) may easily distribute them to others in their necessity." After this exposition of principles, he immediately after lays down distinctly the doctrine of private property. "Community of goods is ascribed," he writes, "to a prescription of the natural law, not

because the natural law dictates that all things should be possessed in common, and that nothing is to be possessed as one's own, but because according to natural law there is no distinction of possessions; this latter is more in accordance with human institution, which appertains to positive law. Hence, the possession of property (of land, therefore) is not contrary to natural law, but is something superadded to it by the inventive working of human reason."¹ In other words, that a man should own this or that portion of land is not *a priori* a dictate of the natural law, but a clear natural inference from it; it is not a right which springs from the very nature of land itself, but one that is originated and determined by human activity. "If that field," writes St. Thomas in another passage, "be considered absolutely (or in itself), there is no reason why it should belong to this one rather than to another; but if it be considered in relation to the cultivation bestowed on it, and to the pacific use made of it, a certain proportion of natural equity requires that it should belong to this one rather than to that other" (*secundum hoc habet quandam commensurationem ad hoc ut sit unius et non alterius*).

In spite of all this, maintain that St. Thomas teaches a communism of goods, and you set him directly against himself; you make him deny in an explanation what he had affirmed in a thesis, and again by confusion of thought you must make him reaffirm what he had denied. This, we submit, is going too far; besides being false, it is utterly ridiculous to suppose that the Angel of the Schools would be guilty of such stupid blundering. If, again, you strain at a word and take it out of its context, you reason backward from common use to common property. Then we have to observe that St. Thomas does not speak of land alone, but of all movable property. If the argument holds good in the one case, it must hold good in the other; and what is for man's daily use is not his own. Hence, since one's horse or coat is for common use, the horse and the coat must also be common property; and then no man is secure when he walks through the streets or rides on the highways. Considered in its mere logical form, the reasoning we have been examining is a fair illustration of the sophism, "*Fallacia a dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*," or "the fallacy of the accident."

This natural right which St. Thomas advocates has been indeed applied differently at different periods and in different countries, but its principle has been always acknowledged. "So great is . . . the regard of the law for private property," writes Blackstone, "that it will not authorize the least violation of it; no, not even

¹ Sum. Theol., 2da 2due, Quaest. 66, Art. 1, 2.

for the general good of the whole community. . . .” “In this and similar cases the legislature alone can—and, indeed, frequently does—interpose and compel the individual to acquiesce,” and this by obliging “the owner to alienate his possessions for a reasonable price.” The power of the legislature has been, in modern times, in most cases transferred to referees or to the civil courts. “By the Constitution of the United States, private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation (Amendments, Article 5). A similar provision is contained in the Constitutions of the several States or recognized as a principle of law. The necessity of making new roads has caused private property to be considered with us of little importance in comparison with the public good, provided compensation be made.”¹

Much of the current misapprehension on this subject has arisen from Locke's views on government. He maintains that “the labor of a man's body and the work of his hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatsoever, then, he removes out of the state that nature hath provided and left it in, he hath mixed his labor with and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property.” To this an annotator on Blackstone answers: “This argument seems to be a *petitio principii*, for mixing labor with a thing can signify only to make an alteration in its shape or form, and if I had a right to the substance before any labor was bestowed upon it, that right still adheres to all that remains of the substance, whatever changes it may have undergone; if I had no right before, it is clear that I have none after, and we have not advanced a single step by this demonstration.”²

Locke's theory on land tenure has, under a different form, been put forward in our time. By him it was advanced rather as a speculation for government action; now it is maintained as the great lever of social reform. The abolition of private property in land, it is hoped, will raise the poor from indigence and put the laboring man on a level with his rich neighbor. Now, as Locke's theory, according to the annotator referred to, was a *petitio principii*, or “a begging of the question,” so the theory now advanced for the relief of distress is based on the sophism, the *non-causa pro causa*—the non-cause for cause. The fact itself of the existence of much widespread distress is a painful commentary on this enlightened century. Poor there always have been and poor there always will be. They are, when just, the beloved of God. But to-day poverty is not something incidental to individuals, but is a chronic disease, begotten, as it would seem, of the political constitutions of

¹ Chitty's “Blackstone,” vol. i., p. 101, note.

² Blackstone's “Comm.,” vol. i., b. 2, p. 5, note.

many nations, and lowered to what is called pauperism. Ordinary indigence can, indeed, as a rule, find relief through the ordinary courses of private or religious benevolence, but the widespread distress of classes who only want work and fair wages demands the succor and equitable superintendence of the governing power of the State.

The direct end of all civil government, it is admitted by all writers, is the common good of the governed. Specifically stated, this good has also been defined to comprise the protection of the rights and the promotion of the temporal happiness of the people in view of their final destiny. How many those rights are, and how differently conditioned, the nature and destiny of man, as well as the bare framework of a state, makes manifest. There are natural, parental, religious, and property rights which antedate all civil law and are above it—rights that spring from civil enactments; and then there are corporate, political, individual rights. In the free, unmolested exercise of these rights, the state is bound to protect its citizens. And not only that, but as being charged with directing the general temporal well-being of the people, it is its duty to see to it, by the laws of political economy, that they have the means of gaining a livelihood suited to their respective social conditions. Those two great objects, the guardianship of right and the securing of the instruments of social happiness, are the two fundamental duties of the state. But do what it may, it will not be able, in all individual instances, to prevent the infringement of right, nor will it be able in all cases to succor distress. Its function is to make general provision for the security of persons and property, and to encourage industry, trades, and commerce, in behalf of all classes. In general, for the relief of distress, the State, in a great measure, must rely on private benevolence, on the economy of the people themselves, or on the fulfilment of those social obligations which bind the rich and the poor together in the same social body. Endowed with the world's wealth, the rich are bound even socially to succor their needy brethren, or to give them facilities for earning a livelihood. This law not being observed, selfishness on the part of the rich has, it has been said, not a little to do with the progress of modern socialism; it has separated more and more class from class, and begotten in some lands enmity to rank among workingmen. It is something astonishing to read that, in such a wealthy country as England, there are at present two and a half millions of paupers, and that in London one out of every five persons dies in a workhouse or a hospital. This insensibility to the hardships of the poor has undoubtedly in part sprung from the exorbitant pursuit of wealth, from worldliness of manners of every kind, but principally from the want of religion. Nothing hardens the heart and dries up so

soon the sources of the higher sensibilities of our nature as the lifeless negations of infidelity or atheism, while, on the other hand, Christian charity is the parent of benevolence; it bridges over the spaces between rank and rank, and by the sympathies it creates draws men together in their brotherhood in Christ. Under the Christian law, it is a precept for the rich to communicate of their goods to the poor. By the Christian State, the teaching of St. Paul should be kept in view as one of the leading features of its political economy—as one of those landmarks that should guide it, in legislation, when dealing with or succoring the distress of labor. “Charge the rich of this world,” wrote the Apostle in the text already quoted, “to do good, to be rich in good works, to give easily, to communicate to others.”

As far as the rich are concerned, they, as a rule, can well secure their own rights; it is only in relation to the laboring classes that the duties of the State are especially to be observed. In former ages, capital and labor were largely linked together by the bond of the same religious faith; masters and workmen knelt at the same altar, and, generally, in the spirit of charity, were governed by the same laws of Church and State. Within the last few centuries, defections from Catholic unity have, in a great measure, changed in many countries the mutual religious relations between masters and workmen. But even now, in these altered circumstances, the Church does all she can to relieve distress, as all countries bear witness; still, in things temporal, her power for good has been considerably diminished, since, being despoiled of her property in most lands, she has not at her command the resources which she formerly had for the relief of the poor, though her sympathy is always with them. The result of this change of things is, that the burden of relieving the hardships of labor and of poverty rests directly on the State. And in place of that benign charity which, by its kindness, took out of indigence half its harshness, our age witnesses a cold, stiff formalism in relieving the poor, and at the same time, by seclusion or confinement, makes them pay, as it were, a penalty for their poverty. This, perhaps, cannot be helped; it is the natural outcome of the bare administration of state law. But be that as it may, it is not precisely of indigence that depends on state alms that we speak here, but of that distress which lies on able-bodied men and women who are willing to work and can find no one to hire them, or of those who have work, but receive for it, we may say, almost starvation wages. How widespread this distress often is, how pinching on families who try to conceal it, how injurious to the healthy growth of youthful constitutions, any acquaintance with the lives of artisans or tradeless laborers in different countries immediately reveals. In some lands, indeed, the

destitution is greater than that in others, and by the inhumanity and ghastly cruelty which sometimes accompany it, fills the soul with horror. But, as a rule, in Christian civilized countries such appalling destitution does not exist; still, widespread distress there often certainly is among the laboring classes. To meet this state of things, and as if driven to desperation by the financial arithmetic of political economy, some governments have counselled emigration to their people, and that when their destitution arose not from an over-crowded population, but when thousands upon thousands of acres of the soil of their country were lying waste or uncultivated. It is, of course, permissible for persons, free from personal obligations, to emigrate, if they will, with the purpose of bettering their condition, but lawfully they cannot be forced to do so. Every one has a right to live in the land of his birth or adoption, and there to be enabled to earn a livelihood. It is only crime that can justly entail banishment from one's native land.

Of late years, in behalf of labor, the land theory which we have just examined, has been presented to the public. By denying the lawfulness of private ownership in land, this theory would do away with all vested rights in landed property, would make land to be the common property of all, the fund from which men were to derive their daily support. That is to say, it would establish one right by cancelling another, and would undertake to redress a social evil by a social injustice. Against this theory man's rational nature protests, since, as we have seen, it dictates as a postulate of justice that man has an inborn right to that which he has made his own by just possession and industry. This is one of these rights which human life for its sustenance demands in order that it may have stable security against the changes of fortune and against infirmity and the feebleness of old age. And what nature witnesses to has been sanctioned, as it has been shown, by the traditions of every age and country. But besides being unjust in principle, the theory, for the end which it proposes to itself, is impracticable. Let us suppose for a moment private landed ownership to be abolished; how are the people to profit by it? Communal ownership could not be carried out in our modern complicated society. It is repugnant to the liberty of ownership which men now claim, as well as to the immediate remuneration which they demand for their labor. It would establish anarchy in view of a theory and would do away with founded rights in order to further a Utopia; it would organize an army of land-agents, and would have the community at large depend on their discretion or benevolence. Or, again, let us suppose the land to be nationalized by just purchase; ownership will then in some form take place, and nature will soon reassert itself. In either of these suppositions, agriculture would not, in our times, meet all the wants of the numerous classes of artisans. Indeed,

it need not do so, since Providence, as we remarked, has so ordained that under commercial law men make out a living, not merely on the products of their own country, but also on those of foreign lands. But is ownership of land really the cause of the hardships of labor? In the labor crises of the past it has not been thought to have been so by the greatest statesmen and political economists.

From 1820 to 1830 or 1835 distress similar to that which we witness in the social world of the present took place in Europe, yet no one thought of attributing it to ownership in land; and when commercial or financial affairs adjusted themselves, prosperity returned, though men continued to own their acres as before. The general opinion of economists has been that the real disturbing cause of industrial pursuits then was "the contraction of the currency." To the same cause some apt students of economics would attribute the present labor distress, while others would say that it is owing to the changes that have taken place in the olden industries by the introduction of machinery; others again would ascribe it to improved methods of transportation or to the growth of extensive monopolies. But whatever may be the cause, it is the duty of statesmanship to deal with it, and while respecting all vested rights, to strike the balance as best it can between capital and labor. The State, being bound to provide for the general good of the community, is justified by equitable means in removing obstacles to that good; in providing, also, that by free interaction among different classes the wealth of the nation be fairly distributed, and that unproductive monopolies do not interfere with the general prosperity. Among the ancient Romans, in periods of great national danger, the law recognized by universal consent was "salus populi, suprema lex," the saving of the people, the supreme law. With them this was a war measure, but among all nations it undoubtedly holds when there is a question of the saving of a people. To decimate them, war is not required, it can be brought about under the reign of peace in different ways; to speak of no others, it can be done by the slow, steady progress of chronic distress, or by the strain, sometimes, of over-work in factory or shop-life, or even in school-life on youthful constitutions. Governments there are that expend millions upon millions of pounds sterling in supporting standing armies or in forming navies, and which look on with stern apathy while their people are dying of starvation or fleeing from their native land as if it were plague-stricken. And still it is the people who make the nation. To such governments, gold and the rules of political economy seem to be dearer than the lives of brave men and virtuous women, and military power and bare land to be greater factors in the building up of a nation than the contentment and patriotism of a people.

EDUCATION IN NEW ORLEANS IN SPANISH COLONIAL DAYS.

ON the 10th of February, 1763, Louisiana, by a Treaty of Cession, passed under the rule of Spain—on paper. Spain, already overburdened with colonies, was not eager to invade her new possessions, and Louisiana was far from being anxious to deliver herself up to her new master. In October, 1764, the first official announcement of the transfer came to New Orleans in a letter from Louis XV. to Governor Abbadie. But to the inhabitants the royal message was but a diplomatic figure of speech. At first they did not notice it. When certain signs told them it was a serious business, they met in convention, and appealed to the king not to separate them from the mother-country. Spain gave them ample time to ingratiate themselves in the favor of *Louis le bien aimé*. They dispatched the richest merchant in the colony to lay their petitions at the feet of the "well-beloved" monarch. Bienville, then in his eighty-sixth year, threw his influence, which should have been great, into the scale in their favor. But their passionate pleadings fell upon dull, cold ears, and Louis, through his infidel minister, Choiseul, refused to keep Louisiana.

Meanwhile, Spain appeared to have forgotten all about her new acquisition. For almost a year no governor was appointed. "Never do to-day what you can safely put off till to-morrow," is a Spanish proverb which relieves from all danger of impetuosity the wise, slow people who put it into practice. When Don Antonio Ulloa was commissioned as governor, he loitered in Havana for nearly another year. The people believed the cession a sham instrument. They were looking for counter-orders when, lo! Spain, after being for years apathetic in the one-sided quarrel, determined to settle it. On the 5th of March the dilatory Ulloa appeared in the streets of the city with two companies of infantry. Needless to say, he was coldly received. Ulloa, then in his fifty-first year, was one of the finest scholars in the world. He was most desirous of conciliating the new subjects of Spain; but as they would not be conciliated, he left them to get over their ill-temper as best they could, and pitched his tent among the reed prairies of the mouth of the river. Here, in a crazy palace of shaking piles, he received the beautiful Marchioness d'Abrado, who came from Peru to become his bride, the parties having engaged themselves when Don Antonio travelled in South America in the interest of science. In

March, 1767, when the banks were at the height of their beauty, the trees robed in pale green, and many of them starred with orange blossoms, the newly-wedded pair came up the river to New Orleans. Ulloa threw open his *salons* to the Creoles. His wife devoted herself to her guests. But her fascinations were unheeded; her beauty found no favor in their eyes; her accomplishments did not dazzle them. Everything the young Señora did displeased them. Trifles¹ were distorted into charges against the luckless couple. Aubry, the French governor, remarked, that the colony scarcely knew whether it was French or Spanish. Ulloa turned for consolation to his books, allowing Aubry to govern for him—a service for which the Spanish government liberally rewarded him. The high-born lady who had come so far to preside over the festivities of Government House, having exerted herself in vain to please the people, in future treated them with indifference.

Towards the end of October the malcontents broke into open insurrection, and patrolled the streets as masters of the town. The women and children fled within doors. Aubry successfully exerted himself to save the life of Ulloa, and hurried him on board a Spanish frigate. On the 29th of October, 1768, the Governor was officially informed of his dismissal from the colony by the insurgents. On the 31st he embarked with his family, and next morning, while the captain was waiting for a fair wind, a band of insurrectionists endangered the lives of all aboard by cutting the cables which held the vessel to her moorings and sending her adrift. On the evening of that day Ulloa left forever the country so persistently antagonistic to him. Aubry denounced to his government the doings of the “rebels” led by a “dozen firebrands whom it was absolutely necessary to punish.”

Whether Señor or Señora Ulloa did anything for education in New Orleans beyond showing the example of a most cultured and scholarly pair, we have been unable to learn. It is almost certain, however, that they did not. The colonists were from first to last bitterly opposed to them. Even the exquisite musical talent which the Marchioness exerted for their pleasure failed to please. They could not forgive her for being the wife of the man they so cordially detested. It is probable that the Ulloas were frequent visitors at the Ursuline Convent, situated but a few squares from their official abode. Within its walls they could find congenial spirits, and persons of culture may be expected to fraternize wherever they

¹ Madame Ulloa made pets of several Indian girls, she sent to Cuba for a nurse for her infant, and with a humanity that does her credit she would not allow refractory slaves to be beaten in her hearing. Worse than all, she laughed heartily when told these things gave offence.

meet. But the fact that the nuns continued intensely French through all changes of government, may have had the effect of lessening the warmth of the friendship between the Ursulines and the scholarly people of Government House. When the news of the revolution reached Madrid, that court resolved that Spain should keep her new acquisition, and that the insult to the Spanish crown must be punished. The most distinguished officer then in the service of Spain, Don Alexander O'Reilly, was commissioned to effect this.

O'Reilly was one of that large and illustrious band of Irishmen who, being disabled by their religion from serving their country as soldiers at home, earned honor, glory, fame, and sometimes fortune, under other banners, and supplied the regiments of several continental nations with their most efficient leaders. Their deeds of heroism were recounted by the Suir and the Shannon, under the shadow of the Galtees and by the cottier's winter fire. And the people persecuted at home were consoled to hear of the renown their brothers and sons were winning under the lilies of France and the sombre-hued banner of Austria and the flaming colors of Spain. In the latter half of the eighteenth century there was no braver or more virtuous Irishman in foreign military service than Alexander O'Reilly of Meath.

On the 18th of August, 1769, this renowned general made his triumphal entry into New Orleans with 2600 men, the choicest of the armies of Spain, picked by himself. Artillery, light infantry, mounted riflemen and cavalry, paraded the *plaza*, like practised veterans as they were. The twenty-four sail which formed the fleet were bright with colors, their rigging being alive with sailors in holiday garb. Shouts of *Viva el Rey* rent the air. The bells of the town pealed merrily, discharges from hundreds of guns shrouded the streets in smoke, and fire flashing along the lines made a grim illumination. Drums and all manner of musical instruments gave out their best, while O'Reilly, preceded by splendidly accoutred men bearing heavy silver maces, moved slowly towards the church. This superb pageant concluded with a *Te Deum*.

The very next day O'Reilly, who was a most energetic and untiring worker, caused the case of the authors of the late insurrection to be investigated. Within two months twelve were found guilty, of whom one died in prison, six were banished and five were shot at Fort St. Charles, behind the Ursuline Convent to the south, where the Mint now stands. The case had been appealed from the Governor's head to his heart; fair ladies besought him with burning words to suspend the execution of the sentence of the court; even his colleagues in office entreated him to assume

this responsibility. But while treating all these supplicants with "the most exquisite politeness," he was inflexible. Though but thirty-four years old, he resisted the pleadings of men and the tears of women, and while his words of refusal were mild and condescending, and he listened to all that could be advanced with extreme gentleness and patience, his mobile features assumed the stony, impassive expression of an Egyptian sphynx, as he announced that the decision of the court was final. In refusing the boon he would gladly have granted, O'Reilly pleaded the orders of the king. Peace reigned once more, and the nuns and their pupils were able to devote themselves without distraction to the improvement of the mind. Among the pages in O'Reilly's retinue was a princely youth of eighteen, Sebastian O'Farrell, who subsequently became governor of Louisiana, and figured conspicuously as the Marquis Casacalvo. He was distantly related to O'Reilly, whose son and heir married the niece of O'Farrell. The younger *Comte* O'Reilly settled in Cuba, where his descendants still live. Casacalvo also founded a distinguished family in the same island.

The wise and enlightened administration of O'Reilly in Louisiana was most favorable to education, and His Excellency did not fail to patronize the existing schools, especially those of the Ursulines. About this time it became fashionable for high officials to visit and patronize convents. The Princess Louise, youngest daughter of Louis XV., had entered the monastery of St. Denis, near Paris—an event which her royal father considered of sufficient importance to be communicated officially to every court in Europe, and, oddly enough, it fell to the infidel minister, Duc de Choiseul, to make the announcement, which was couched in the following terms:

"The deep and enduring piety of Madame Louise, the king's daughter, has inspired her with the project of joining the Carmelites. She tested her vocation, and having obtained the king's consent, she yesterday entered a monastery of that order at St. Denis, where she proposes to make her profession as a simple Religious, leaving absolutely whatever appertains to the world or its dignities. The king desires me to announce this exemplary and touching event to you." This document is dated April 12, 1770.

It is not unlikely that O'Reilly had friends and perhaps relatives in the royal Abbey of St. Denis. The Prioress who received the Princess Louise, "Julienne de MacMahon," was an Irishwoman, and the rest of the nuns were, like himself, exiles from Erin, Irish by birth or extraction. "I have an Irish guard among the Carmelites," said Louis XV.

The successors of O'Reilly adopted his policy, interfering as little as possible with established customs and filling the offices

for the most part with men of French descent. The nine Spanish governors were less masters than fathers; they were all, though in different degrees, men of marked intellectual power and fine attainments. They made themselves one with the people. Many of the governors and other high officials allied themselves in marriage with the families of the soil. The New Orleans girl who married Count Galvez fulfilled a brilliant destiny as vice-queen of Mexico.

This same Galvez, in conjunction with Count Arthur O'Neill (1781), recovered Pensacola from the English. He had previously scaled the heights of Baton Rouge and driven them from that and other forts. These victories brought Louisiana a large accession of English-speaking subjects, to minister to whom the king of Spain sent from the university of Salamanca "four Irish priests of recognized zeal, virtue, and cultivation." These gentlemen, Fathers McKenna, Savage, Lamport, and White, were, so far as we can ascertain, the first secular clergymen who exercised the ministry in Louisiana.¹

Meanwhile, great attention was paid to education. Governor Miro, whose wife, a McCarthy, had been a pupil of the Ursulines, mentions eight schools in successful operation in 1788, frequented by 400 French-speaking scholars. These do not include the Ursuline schools, always largely attended, or the Spanish schools, for which professors of the first universities had come from Spain. In 1785 the population of New Orleans was 4900, including blacks and Indians. The population of the whole colony was 31,433. Owing to the preference of the people for the French language, the Spanish schools, established at the expense of the Crown,² were not largely attended till towards the close of the Spanish domination. Bishop Peñalver, who came to New Orleans in 1795, and wrote unfavorably of the state of morals and religion in that city, admits that "the Spanish schools have been kept as they ought to have been." The manners of the young were re-

¹ One of these priests officiated at Natchez. In 1844 Bishop Chanche petitioned Congress to restore to that city the property given to the Church by the Spanish Government. Natchez stands chiefly on church property. The Bishop found the necessary documents in Havana, and was allowed to copy them by the Captain-general of Cuba, Señor O'Donnell. But his application came too late. The lands had already been sold to private parties by the U. S. Government.

² In 1772 there came from Spain Don Andreas Lopez De Armestro, a priest, Director of the Schools, Don Pedro Aragon, *maestro de Syntaxis*; Don Manuel Diaz de Lura, professor of Latin, and Don Francisco de la Celena, *maestro de primeras letras*. And four Spanish ladies took the veil among the Ursulines. "This," says Martin, "was the only encouragement given to learning during the whole period of Spanish Government." And it was more than enough, considering that *Nueva-Orleans* was already well supplied with schools.

fined and elegant. They were obedient and affectionate to their parents, to whom they showed great respect. And we think it would not be impossible to show that, in all the essentials of a good education, the people of New Orleans were, comparatively speaking, as well educated a century ago as they are now—perhaps better.

Since the memorable 18th of August, 1769, when the terrible vision of O'Reilly's hussars prancing and curveting amid the blare of trumpets, the glitter of brass, and the flash of steel, had cowed the people into completest subjection, there had been no political disturbance. Spiritually, the country had fallen to the ordinary of Havana. He sent hither Spanish Franciscans who reported unfavorably of their French brethren and of church matters in general. One of the new friars, F. Cirilo, subsequently became his coadjutor, with special charge of Louisiana. Cirilo is the only ecclesiastic who wrote a word of censure of the nuns, but he refers merely to lack of strictness of cloister. He mentions their director, F. Prosper, "who is seventy-two years old, strong and robust, and capable of directing them." Cirilo urges upon masters the obligation of watching over the morals of their slaves, and mentions among the good deeds of O'Reilly that he had got forty persons of this class, who had previously lived in sin, married *coram facie Ecclesie*. Indeed, that governor, to his honor be it recorded, always took sides with the weaker races. He declared it to be "contrary to the mild and beneficent laws of Spain that Indians should be held in bondage," and commanded families who used them as slaves to emancipate them.

From the following, which occurs in a State paper written by Baron Carondelet to his government, April 27, 1793, it would appear that Cirilo was in *Nueva-Orleans* as Bishop: "When I arrived in New Orleans I found it divided into two factions—the one headed by Governor Miro and backed by the Bishop, etc." In 1794 Louisiana was finally detached from Havana, and New Orleans has since been a distinct see.

The Ursulines prospered greatly under the Spanish rule, for which they had at first so little welcome. Mother Landelle, who was Superior when the revolutionary troubles were at their height, in 1768, wrote to France for subjects, but the three who answered her appeal were not allowed to become members of her community until leave was granted by the Court of Madrid. In 1795 Bishop Peñalver complains that "the nuns are so intensely French that they refuse to receive Spanish subjects ignorant of French, and shed tears for being obliged to make their spiritual exercises in Spanish books." In the early years of the Spanish ascendancy,

the nuns gave up the service of the sick,¹ partly because their number had grown alarmingly small, and partly because of the dislike of the Spaniards of that day to nuns undertaking work outside their enclosure.

Many Spanish ladies joined the Ursulines, the most distinguished of whom was Monica di Ramos, who entered the Chartres street monastery in 1770, at the age of nineteen. Monica was born in Havana. The *Señorita*, as she was called, seemed destined from childhood to some great and holy end. While a parlor-boarder in the Convent of Santa Clara, her soul was filled with a strong desire to devote herself to God and the salvation of souls, in some special manner, and this impelled her to cross the seas and enter the cloisters of St. Ursula. Her companion, Sister Antonia del Castillo, who was professed with her, afterwards founded the Ursuline schools of Puerto Principe. Mother Ramos was several years mistress of novices, and in this office showed great zeal and charity, being the first to labor and the last to seek repose. So gentle and amiable were her manners that the Religious were wont to style her their "kind mother," and seculars "the noble lady always devoted to duty." One of her daughters thus apostrophized her in an elegy written in Spanish after her death: "O Monica! admirable even among the perfect, thy kind heart gained all."

Mother Ramos became Superior in 1785, and remained such during the incumbency of Governor Miro. Like most of the Spanish governors, Miro was a fine English scholar, and with his wife, Señora McCarthy Miro, was very popular. The piety and charity of this illustrious pair were lauded throughout the colony. They built a hospital² for those unfortunate creatures afflicted with leprosy, a loathsome disease supposed to have been brought hither from Africa, and which has not yet wholly disappeared in Louisjana. As Miro made stringent regulations for the religious observance of Sundays and holydays, the colored people were not allowed to begin their Sunday evening dances till after Vespers. All the governors were most friendly to the nuns. Their schools and hospital were frequently visited by these high officials, who lived but a few squares from the monastery. On November 1, 1795, Mother Farjon being Superior, Bishop Peñalver wrote: "Excellent results are obtained from the convent, in which a good many girls are educated. . . . This is a nursery of future matrons who will inculcate on their children the principles they imbibe here."

The bishop's experience in New Orleans was not cheering. Immigrants imbued with the atheistical sentiments—we cannot

¹ They were empowered to do this by a brief from the Pope.

² On *La Terre des Lèpreux*, in the rear of the city.

say doctrines—of the so-called philosophers of Europe, and many of the wild and lawless from all parts of America made sad havoc in New Orleans during the last decade of the Spanish domination. In 1799 he deplores that “adventurers who have no religion and no God have deteriorated the morals of the people.” “It is true,” he proceeds, “that resistance to religion has always shown itself here, but never with such scandal as now prevails.” By a secret treaty Spain returned Louisiana to France October 1, 1800; but three years elapsed before France openly accepted the gift.

To the Spanish schools succeeded the famous College of Orleans, the first educational institution incorporated by the Legislature of Louisiana, situated on the corner of Hospital and St. Claude streets. During the first quarter of the present century the forest primeval came to its very gates. Every spring the thorny arms of the blackberry bush, spangled with white blossoms, made a tangled labyrinth of undergrowth, and as the flowers grew into green, red and black berries, the small boys of the city invaded the forest's edge to seek the luscious fruit. The pupils of this college were celebrated for their classical attainments and courteous manners. Here Charles Gayarré, the historian¹ of Louisiana, received his education in English, French, Spanish, classics and mathematics. This venerable gentleman still walks among us, though past four score, and, as a scholar and an author Louisiana cannot show his superior.

An apostate priest, said to have voted in the Convention for the death of Louis XVI., and against whom other grave charges were made, was appointed principal of the College of Orleans about 1816. The people, on learning his history, indignantly withdrew their sons, and the regicide fled. Nor could most of them ever be induced to send them back. The institution declined from day to day, and was finally closed. A church was erected on its site in 1841, perhaps in a spirit of reparation. To this church, St. Augustine's, is attached a thoroughly Catholic school.

It is worthy of note that Hon. Charles Gayarré learned English so well in New Orleans as to be mistaken for an Englishman when he travelled in England early in the present century. Daniel Clark, a wealthy Irishman who lived in the colony during the greater part of the Spanish ascendancy, was U. S. Consul in New Orleans under the later Spanish governors. Señor Gayoso, the only Spanish governor who died in office (1799), was educated in England, and to the convivial habits there contracted his countrymen attributed his death at the early age of 48. From all this and

¹ F. X. Martin also wrote a History of Louisiana, but there is about as much heart and style in Martin's work as in a railway time-table. Besides, Martin never had access to State papers in Spain bearing on the history of the colony.

from other sources it may be gathered that English was always largely spoken in Louisiana, though not universally, as it has been for many years.

The closing decade of Spanish rule, like that extending from 1760 to 1770, was a period of turmoil and anxiety. Red Republicanism and Jacobinism sought admission; the French Revolution had its influence on the whites, and the success of the San Domingo revolution excited the blacks to form a conspiracy for the ruin of the whites, which, however, was discovered in time to be frustrated. To those who could read the signs of the times it was evident that Louisiana would, happily, through force of circumstances, soon cease to be an appanage of any European power, and enter as a Territory, and later as a sovereign State, the recently formed Union.

Rumors that the mild rule of Spain was to be exchanged for the French revolutionary government naturally raised a tempest in the Ursuline cloisters. The excitement and terror of the nuns who feared a repetition of the horrors that had disgraced France, were such that Mother Ramos, on the 4th of October, 1802, made a formal petition to the king of Spain, Charles IV., to allow her community to withdraw to Havana or Mexico, or some other city in his dominions. The Spanish annals say that the peace which had reigned under Spanish rule passed away with it, that the revolutionary government showed a bitter hatred of Spain, and that, as many of the nuns were Spanish, they came in for their share of persecution. Heretofore, the fullest religious liberty had been enjoyed in Louisiana. Under the "unenlightened" sway of Catholic France and Spain, not a hair of any one's head was ever touched from religious motives. The old Creoles would shrug their shoulders when they heard that witches were burned, Quakers hanged, and Catholics tortured in New England by a people who claimed liberty of conscience for themselves. Now it was confidently expected that French rule would inaugurate religious persecution, and it seemed only discretion, that better part of valor, to retire before the storm burst upon them. The priests were allowed to depart, but all parties were anxious to keep the Ursulines. Their schools had been a blessing and a boon to the colony from its earliest days. The French colonial prefect, Laussat, besought them not to think of forsaking the city; the chief citizens knelt to them, but in vain.

It was not a Spaniard, however, but a Frenchwoman, that reproached Laussat with the hideous crimes the Revolution had perpetrated (1789-1803) against religion and humanity, and denounced the French Republic as impious and sacrilegious: "Your promises of protection," said she, "are lies. You know well that Louisiana has been sold to the United States, whose President is not particu-

larly friendly to Spain." The other religious were terrified at the vehemence of these denunciations, but no guillotine was set up in Louisiana, and Laussat gallantly excused the lady on account of her great age. We may add that Sister Margaret died in Cuba in 1811, in her eighty-second year. The Havana annals note that the surviving Sisters were scarcely able to chant the office at her obsequies, "by reason of their great weeping for this beloved mother."

Mother Ramos consulted the Vicar-general, Hasset, Governor Salcedo, and the late Governor O'Farrell, Marquis Casacalvo, a superb soldier, born like herself in 1751, and allied by blood to Count O'Reilly, under whom he had served as a cadet in Louisiana, in 1769, and consequently knew the country from the earliest days of Spanish rule. It was unanimously agreed that the safest course for the nuns to adopt under the present critical circumstances was to retire to the dominions of the king of Spain.

It is customary for the Ursulines to make a retreat immediately before Whit-Sunday, and renew their vows on that solemn day. Greatly did the New Orleans nuns need the strength and grace to be derived from such pious exercises on the feast of Pentecost, May 29, 1803. On the night of that day sixteen nuns, without waiting for the answer of the Catholic king, left the Chartres street monastery forever. With their faces and forms concealed by their ample robes, they issued slowly by the chapel gate into Ursuline street, accompanied to the inclosure limits by the few who remained behind, and whom they were never again to meet. Those who left lauded the courage of those who stayed: "Great was their heroism to stay in New Orleans fighting for God, never heeding the dangers that surrounded them, offering all their pains with loving gratitude to God. The priests had already left, scarcely any remaining, owing to the critical condition of Louisiana." Bishop Peñalver had been translated to Guatemala in 1802. Dr. Porro, second Bishop of New Orleans, died in Rome the same year, on the eve of his intended departure for his episcopal city. By the transfer of Louisiana to the United States, New Orleans fell under the jurisdiction of Bishop Carroll, and for twelve years Bishop Porro had no successor.

Under the shadow of the convent chapel on that bright May evening (1803), a sadly beautiful tableau was dimly visible in the glare of the oil-lamps recently swung across the streets by the energetic Baron Carondelet,¹ and the flickering of the torches and lanterns borne by the slaves who headed the procession. The

¹ One of the principal streets in New Orleans perpetuates the name of Carondelet—Baronne street, that of his wife, *La Baronne*.

nuns were accompanied by Vicar-general Hasset on the part of the Church, and, on the part of the king by O'Farrell, Marquis of Casacalvo, and the aged Salcedo, Governor of Louisiana, both richly uniformed and surrounded by attendants in gaudy liveries. The boarders and orphans formed a sorrowing group about their beloved teachers, and the slaves who worked in the quaint gardens came out to look their last on their kind mistresses. Outside the throng were *gens d'armes* in brilliant uniforms faced with gold, Indians in picturesque feathers and blankets, and *serenos* (watchmen) calling out the hour. Among the old friends who came to see the Religious off, one might note the powdered head, the gold and velvet coat, the frilled and jewelled shirt front, the red-heeled shoe and silver buckle—the shining gown of stiff brocade, the lace head-dress set over high-combed hair, which we see imprisoned in the sweet family portraits of a by-gone age treasured in many a Louisiana home.

Slowly over the sedgy *banquettes* (sidewalks), made passable here and there by the gunwales of fleet boats, moved these dark-robed sorrowing women. They were leaving the convent in which some had lived from childhood, in which all had hoped to die, to seek a home they knew not where, and carve out for themselves a destiny they knew not how. No preparations had been made for the journey. They carried away only some documents¹ which ought to have been left behind, and a few ornaments for the altar which their Sisters forced upon them as precious souvenirs of their beloved old monastery. A negro and his son, a boy of fifteen, were their only escort. They embarked in a small vessel which had scarcely left her moorings when she was becalmed. For three days they awaited a favorable wind. Their Sisters sent them refreshments, and “though far away in body were with them in spirit,” as the charming notes that passed between the parties testified. “All were united in the bonds of charity, and tried to act in this difficult situation with the greatest purity of intention.”

Our nuns and their black servants had ample leisure to study the little Franco-Spanish city they were leaving forever. It made a pretty picture in the summer sunlight. What forms the French quarter to-day, and is, save in its antiquarian and historic aspect, the least important part of New Orleans, was then the whole city. It extended from the river to the ramparts (Rampart street) and from Duane street to the Esplanade. The houses near the river were of brick roofed with tiles; a levée crowned with willow and orange trees protected the town from periodical overflows. The *plaza*, a

¹ As the nuns expected the French Revolution in miniature in New Orleans, they allowed these papers to be sent to Havana for safety.

green lawn with diagonal walks, was crowded late and early with the air-loving citizens. Above this rose the cathedral of Almonaster (a Spaniard who spent 2,000,000 dollars on his adopted city), an exquisite structure with white turrets and shining cross, in and out of which at all hours women veiled in Moorish style and attended by slaves might be seen gliding, often laden with votive offerings. The silvery bells of the convent echoed the mellow tones of the cathedral chimes as they rang out the *Angelus* morning, noon, and night. The cabildo, the calaboza, the hospitals, and the forts, all teeming with religious and historic associations; their own loved convent then visible from the river; the houses daubed with violet or saffron, pink or white, a mosaic of colors, were surrounded by open galleries and *jalousies*, decked with flowering shrubs and shaded by moss-draped trees—perhaps the nuns, as they lay rocking in the river, tried to enjoy these sights. Before them was the busy levée—old *négresses* with Indian baskets full of rice-cakes, singing in “gumbo French” the nutritious qualities of their *belle calla*; colored wenches bringing Marseilles jars to be filled by the water carriers; picturesque gypsies selling nut-cakes in the arcades of the court-house, about the corners of old quadrangular buildings, or among the shadows of a many-pillared colonial villa. On these warm days merchants put their goods on the *banquettes*, and waresmen praised their wares in many a dialect. Towards sunset negroes danced the *bamboula* and the *calinda* in vacant patches, and jabbered and sang in the barbaric jargon of Senegambia.

No doubt the poor nuns wearied of these sights and sounds, and were heartily glad when a favorable wind arose. Gradually they lost sight of the twin turrets of the cathedral and its glittering cross, swept down the river and out of the dreary passes by which it glides into the sea. Many a time has the writer been actually depressed in going through these channels, in which whatever way one looks one sees, perhaps, the bleakest prospect on earth. How must the poor nuns have felt! Their voyage across the gulf was tedious. They reached Havana on June 23d. As they were entirely unexpected, no preparations had been made for them. The Bishop sent six to the Convent of Santa Clara (Poor Clares), six to Santa Catalina (Dominican nuns), and four to Santa Teresa (Carmelites).

On the 25th of July Mother Ramos was consoled by a kind letter from Madrid, signed by the king, in reply to hers of October, 1802. His Catholic Majesty expressed himself much pleased with the good the nuns had effected in the past, and graciously invited them to continue their useful labor in Havana. He granted each Sister a monthly pension of twenty-seven dollars, payable till his

death, and strongly recommended the Ursulines to the fatherly care of the bishop.

The people of Havana welcomed the refugees with tender, respectful kindness, and began at once to build them a magnificent monastery. To this they went in carriages, escorted by the Governor and all the nobility of the city (1804). Many distinguished ladies joined them, and the training of the novices and the education of the future teachers of the Order were confided to the only Irishwoman in the band that fled from New Orleans, "Sister Felicitas Carder." Twelve Spaniards, three Frenchwomen, and herself composed this band. The splendor of the new house was a genuine surprise to the Sisters, especially the finely carved stalls and sparkling chandeliers in the chapel. It is particularly and gratefully noted that each Religious had her own cell, which contained a "leathern bed, two chairs, and a clothes-press in the shape of a table."

Fearing that it might be inferred that they were fugitives from their monastery because they left it late at night, the nuns took care to record that their passports were regularly signed, that they were escorted to the ship by the highest religious, civil, and military officials, and, finally, that the hour of departure was not chosen by them, but appointed by the captain. They reiterated that the only motive of their departure was "to save themselves from the impious revolutionary government of France." The French claimed authority over the property of Religious, and confiscated such property in France. It was said that Laussat meant to sell the New Orleans monastery or turn it from its sacred purpose. All manner of wild rumors were afloat. Spain, by her commissioners, O'Farrell and Salcedo, ceded the colony to France, on November 30, 1803. Twenty days later the United States took possession of Louisiana, having purchased it from France for fifteen million dollars.

It comes not within the scope of this paper to recount the story of the Havana Ursulines. We shall merely add that what they had feared in Louisiana came upon them, after a short period of prosperity, in Cuba. The Government closed their novitiate, and compelled them to leave the cloister and put off their sacred garb. After suffering in many ways for years, they were allowed to re-assemble in community in 1824. But the beloved Mother Ramos, the joy and consolation of her daughters in all their afflictions, did not live to see this happy time. She died October 23, 1823. Their chief friend during their long and grievous persecution was Very Rev. Don Bernardo O'Gahan, Canon of the Havana Cathedral. Queen Isabella II., whose confessor was made first Archbishop of Havana, has been a generous benefactress to these nuns.

On one occasion Her Majesty sent them a gift of twelve thousand dollars.

Early American times may be said to belong to the Spanish period, not only because there was no social or religious change for many years, but also because there was in the breast of every one either a hope or a fear that Spain would retake Louisiana. When the stars and stripes replaced the tri-color, and *Nouvelle-Orleans* and *Nueva Orleans* had given place forever to *New Orleans*, the nuns were more uneasy than ever. And not causelessly, for nothing could be more dark and threatening than the aspect of public affairs. The Creoles did not take kindly to the new order of things. And so little was the genius of the American Government understood in her latest acquisition, that people supposed to be well informed kept the nuns in continual agitation; to-day they were to be expelled; to-morrow their property, which was considerable, was to be confiscated; next day, the utmost concession granted them was leave to stay in their convent till the present inmates should die out.

Internally, the nuns were doing well. Two subjects had been recently added to their staff, and their boarders numbered 170. Under these circumstances the Superior, Mother Farjon, addressed a letter to Bishop Carroll, which he forwarded to Mr. Madison, then Secretary of State, later President, who sent the following courteous reply, July 28, 1804:

"I have had the honor to lay before the President your letter of the 14th of December, who views with pleasure the public benefit resulting from the benevolent endeavors of the respectable persons in whose behalf it is written. Be assured that no opportunity will be neglected of manifesting the real interest he takes in promoting the means of affording to the youth of this new portion of the American dominion a pious and useful education, and of evincing the grateful sentiments due to those of all religious persuasions who so laudably devote themselves to its diffusion. It was under the influence of such feelings that Governor Claiborne had already assured the ladies of this monastery of the entire protection which will be afforded them after the recent change of government.

"I have the honor to be, with great respect, etc.,

JAMES MADISON."

Mother Farjon wrote direct to the President, who consoled her with the following reply:

"The President of the United States to Sœur Thérèse de St. Xavier Farjon, Supérieure, and the Nuns, etc.:"

"I have received, Holy Sisters, the letters you have written to me, wherein you express anxiety for the property vested in your institution by the former Government of Louisiana. The principles of the Constitution of the United States are a sure guarantee to you that it will be preserved to you sacred and inviolate, that your institution will be permitted to govern itself according to its own voluntary rules, without interference from the civil authority. Whatever diversity of shade may appear in the religious opinions of our fellow-citizens, the charitable objects of your institution cannot be indifferent to any; and its furtherance of the wholesome purposes of society by training up its young members in the way they should go, cannot fail to insure it the patronage of the Government it is under. Be assured it will meet with all the protection my office can give it.

"I salute you, Holy Sisters, with friendship and respect,
THOMAS JEFFERSON."

The first American governor, Claiborne, treated the Ursulines with great deference. On taking office he assured them, on the part of the President, of the protection of the United States Government. Early in his administration a comedy was put on the stage in which the religious state was ridiculed; the Lady Abbess invoked the interference of His Excellency, who at once communicated with the mayor, "to whom belongs the duty of checking the abuses of the stage." A courteous reply, in which the Governor expresses great regret that the feelings of these pious ladies should have been wounded, concludes:

"The sacred objects of your Order, the amiable characters that compose it, and the usefulness of their temporal cares, cannot fail to command the esteem and confidence of the good and virtuous. I pray you, Holy Sisters, to receive the assurances of my great respect and sincere friendship. I salute you, etc.,
WILLIAM CLAIBORNE."

No one could be more kind and respectful to the Sisters than the Protestants Madison and Claiborne, and Jefferson, who is usually classed as an infidel. When Jefferson died, leaving his family destitute, Louisiana, mindful of his courtesy, voted his heirs ten thousand dollars.

But despite the kindness of these officials, many within the convent and outside were extremely unsettled. Having changed rulers three times in twenty days, they could not believe they were at last under a stable government. The sale or cession was very

unpopular. There were sympathizers with Spain, and Jacobins, and Burrites, and "dangerous Americans,"¹ who wanted back Spanish rule. In external appearance and accomplishments Claiborne contrasted poorly with O'Farrell, the "lordly Casacalvo," whose "exquisite politeness"² rather embarrassed the republican Governor. The people, accustomed to see only fine linguists in high places, complained that neither Claiborne nor his colleague, Wilkinson, could speak a word of French or Spanish.

Religion was in a deplorable state. Father Hasset died in 1804. F. Antonio Sedella, who, for attempting to introduce the Inquisition in 1789, had been summarily dismissed by Governor Miro, had found his way back. He was again dismissed by Vicar-general Walsh in 1805, but appealed to the parishioners and was reinstated by them. The affair was brought to the civil courts, and there were Valesians in New Orleans as well as in Ireland. The 4th of July was celebrated by a grand High Mass and *Te Deum* in the Cathedral. It is said that death removed Father Walsh, but not the ecclesiastical troubles that had harassed him, which ended in a schism. The aged F. Olivier, appointed Vicar-general by Bishop Carroll, December 27, 1806, was the only priest in the city who had faculties.

Since the expulsion of the Jesuits, the Capuchins had been directors of the Ursulines, but from the opening of the century they appear no more in that capacity. Their directors since have been F. F. Olivier, 1806, Moni and Sibour, 1822, Richard, 1834, Janney and Roussillon till 1842, when M. l'Abbé Perché succeeded till 1870, when he was raised to the episcopate. The Jesuits then, after the lapse of over a century, resumed their direction.

In 1812 Bishop Carroll sent Rev. William Dubourg, a native of San Domingo, to regulate affairs; but so many obstacles were raised by those who should have aided him, that he placed the city under an interdict. The Cathedral was closed, and in the Ursuline chapel only was Mass celebrated. The chaplain being over eighty, the nuns feared they might soon be deprived of Mass and the sacraments, and they petitioned the Holy Father to allow

¹ Among the Americans who posed as friends of Spain was Wilkinson: "I shall always be ready," said he, "to defend the interests of Spain with my tongue, my pen, and my sword." "Thank you, dearest friend," said Governor Miro. "I am anxious to become a Spaniard, the first opportunity." "You! a Spaniard, Sir," exclaimed Miro; "Oh, no! That cannot be. Continue to dissemble and work under ground. Retain your American pen, etc. You can serve us better in that guise." "Thus spoke Spanish pride and honor," says Gayarré. "Is there on record a more striking specimen of withering contempt?"

² When reproached for returning the salutation of a negro with as much gracious respect as he would that of a prince, Casacalvo mildly asked: "And do you suppose that I would suffer myself to be outdone in politeness by a negro?"

them to go to France, where peace now reigned. His Holiness himself deigned to reply in the following letter addressed to Mother Marie Olivier :

"MADAME: Your letter of May 2 reached us only towards the end of September. We are very sensible of your good wishes for our preservation and the success of our enterprises, always directed to the glory of God and the advantage of the Church. As to the inquietudes that agitate you regarding your spiritual direction, they cannot last, for M. Dubourg has received from Us Bulls, and has been consecrated at Rome, by our order, Bishop of the diocese of New Orleans, to which he will soon return. You may, then, be tranquil as to your future, and give up the project of going to France ; you can do much more for religion where you are. Therefore we exhort you to redouble your zeal for young persons of your sex and for the eternal salvation of your neighbor. We have your community continually present to our mind, especially in our prayers, to obtain for you all the graces you need, and we give you, with effusion of heart, our Apostolic benediction.

"Given at Castle Gandolfo, near Rome, the 16th of October, 1815, of our Pontificate the XVI. year.

PIUS VII., PP."

Abbé Dubourg officiated at the thanksgiving for the success of the American arms in the battle of New Orleans. From their galleries and dormer windows the nuns could see the smoke rising from the plains of Chalmette and hear the sharp report of rifles and the thunder of cannon, January 8, 1815. All night they watched before the Blessed Sacrament, beseeching the Lord of Hosts to give victory to the Americans. Over the entrance of the monastery was exposed an image of Our Lady of Prompt Succor, still religiously preserved by the New Orleans Ursulines. That morning Abbé Dubourg said mass in the convent chapel for the same intention. There were present only women and children; the men were on the battle-field. Humanly speaking, the English were certain to win. Never had the nuns been in such danger. The horrible watchword of the enemy was *Booty and Beauty*. Had the day gone against Jackson, he would, had he survived, have blown up the city. "For," said he, using energetic expletives which we forbear from quoting, "New Orleans shall never fall into the hands of the British."

A magnificent pageant celebrated this great victory. General Jackson entered the city in triumph on January 23d, 1815. In the midst of the historic *plaza*, now Jackson square, a triumphal arch was erected supported by symbolic figures. Under this he was

crowned by a fair girl who represented Louisiana. He moved slowly through an avenue of lovely girls representing the States and Territories, with silver stars on their foreheads, flags in their right hands, and hanging from their left arms baskets of flowers which they emptied beneath the feet of the preserver of New Orleans. M. Dubourg received him at the church door.

It is doubtful if any who witnessed the procession of July 13, 1734, were present January 23, 1815, though some of the Creoles and negroes live to a great age. But many were there—the whole city turned out to do honor to its saviour—that remembered the picked veterans of Spain who paraded the same square and drew up before the church, under another warrior of the same race—a race always enamored of religion and poetry and military glory. But the gallant O'Reilly was judge and saviour, whereas Jackson was saviour alone. There was not, as he poetically said, a cypress leaf in the laurel circlet that crowned him.

The conqueror¹ visited the nuns to receive their felicitations, and thank them for their prayers and vows in his behalf. Nor did he ever omit to call on the nuns on his subsequent visits to New Orleans. Jackson was the last great soldier that passed into the cloisters of the old monastery, and the only President of the United States that ever stood within its precincts.

After the battle of New Orleans the convent school rooms were turned into infirmaries, and the nuns resumed their *rôle* of hospital nurses. Their schools flourished more than ever. The people were now thoroughly reconciled to American rule, and all hopes or fears of again becoming an appanage of any European power had perished forever. In 1817 Bishop Dubourg brought the nuns nine postulants from Europe. In 1821 he wrote to Quebec for a few experienced members. His letter shows the state of the convent: "In point of numbers the house gives me no cause for alarm, but when I consider the age of the ancient pillars of that edifice, and that, at the moment, not remote, of their fall, there will remain only feeble reeds to replace them, I cannot be tranquil as to the consequences." This metaphorical language was meant to convey that, as the nuns were all very old or very young, there were none in the prime of life to succeed the elders. "Send us, then," he continues, dropping metaphor, "three or four professed nuns of mature age, good judgment, and formed to the practice of virtue, to fill the void between the aged and the young." It was far easier to travel from Quebec to Europe than from that city to New Orleans. But volunteers were found for the perilous

¹ There were nuns in the convent when Jackson visited it who could describe for him the later French governors and all the Spanish governors.

journey, and three nuns, whose ages ranged from thirty to forty, came to aid their New Orleans sisters, "a precious acquisition" which all received as "a boon from heaven." Three Ursulines, driven from Boston in 1834, took refuge with the New Orleans nuns, to whom they rendered important services. One of these ladies, Irish by birth, still (1887) lives.

The nuns built in 1821 a spacious monastery three miles from the city, capable of accommodating four or five hundred pupils. To this they removed,¹ without ceremony of any kind, in vacation of 1824. Three nuns and a novice took up their abode in it on July 26th. Two weeks later several other Sisters and the boarders followed, the Superior and some others remaining in the city till the closing of the day-school in September. The early dwellers in the new home had many privations; having no cooking apparatus, their meals were sent from the old house. Once their caterer did not come till evening, nor was his arrival a source of much comfort. He presented only empty dishes, his cart having upset on the way. Even at this late date, depredations by Indians in the suburbs of the city were not unknown, and the nuns were so much afraid that they could not sleep. Finally, one of the bravest, Sister Marie Olivier, offered to keep watch while the others slept. But neither Indians nor other robbers made their appearance in her hours of patrol. She was kept busy chasing rats, which ran in every direction, making dreadful noises. For two months the nuns had Mass on Sundays only, Monseigneur Dubourg himself officiating as their chaplain and director. The community then (1824) numbered twenty, two of whom are still living (1886).

Bishops Dubourg, Rosati, De Neckère, and Blanc are mentioned with grateful affection in the Ursuline records. They never left the city without paying farewell visits to the Sisters and begging their prayers. And on their return they would at once call on them. Their visits were frequent and most paternal. Ceremonious receptions were given them only on their feasts. Within the convent they were as fathers in the midst of their families. The pupils would continue their games before them, or gather around them to hear their amiable words. Bishop De Neckère used regularly to give the Religious lessons in astronomy, philosophy, chemistry, and natural history. He took the greatest delight in instructing those scholars who corresponded by their intelligence and application to his paternal devotion.

The French, Spanish, and early American governors paid the

¹ One of the nuns had not been outside her cloister since her entrance, in 1760. This aged lady was overcome with tears and emotion when obliged to pass beyond the grille on the way to her new home in 1824.

Ursulines ceremonious visits at stated times, and any cause of complaint they referred to these gentlemen was immediately removed. When Louisiana became a State in 1812, and Claiborne, who had governed by appointment since 1804, was elected governor, he, and all officials under him, especially his Secretary of State, McCarthy, showed them every possible courtesy. Apart from the troubles of the Church, which were a keen source of grief to these good Religious, a long era of peace and prosperity began for them with Claiborne's administration. Johnson was the last governor who paid them an official visit and a New Year's call, in 1828. Jackson visited them the same year. Though men of French descent and men of the lineage of O'Reilly and O'Farrell have since occupied the high position of chief magistrate of this State, the courtesies shown the nuns by the earlier governors have been discontinued since 1828.

Madame Duchesne, of the Sacred Heart Order, who came to New Orleans in 1818, and shared the generous hospitality of the Ursulines, says they educated nearly all the girls in Louisiana. She found in the convent almost three hundred boarders receiving a Christian education, besides many *negresses* and *mulattresses* who assembled for catechism every evening. "The blacks," she writes, "gather around Abbé Martial (the convent chaplain) with the fervor of the early Christians gathering about St. Peter, and when the signal gun obliges them to withdraw, they complain of not being allowed to remain all night at their pious exercises." This is not the description commonly given of the black and yellow people, the quadroons and octoroons, by those who have never read their secret history in the letters and diaries of the Religious who labored among them, and who would have us believe that all Africans spent their evenings in the wild and terrible orgies of Congo square.

Madame Duchesne, who had been a Visitation nun before the Revolution, was charmed with her sojourn among the daughters of St. Ursula, as nuns still living who were boarders in 1818 can testify. Without the walls she found little to console her. There were but two priests in a city of 15,000 souls. Including the chaplains of convent, barracks and hospitals, there never had been less than seven priests of various nationalities on duty in New Orleans during the Spanish domination, all being paid by the king of Spain. O'Reilly considered eighteen priests necessary for the spiritual wants of the Louisiana¹ of his day. The Sacred Heart nun speaks disparagingly of the state of morals where she had expected to find only "primitive families, simple, innocent and pure." The Louisi-

¹ The population of Louisiana in O'Reilly's day was over thirteen thousand.

ana girls did not edify her, yet her companion, Madame Audé, wrote a little later: "The children are obedient and have excellent manners." First impressions of new countries are often misleading, because exaggerated. Vice is bold and readily leaps to the surface; virtue is modest and too often timid. There was more good in New Orleans than could be seen at a glance, and had Madame Duchesne labored a few years in the city her views would have been considerably modified. The beautiful devotion to the Sacred Heart had been introduced by the Ursulines, and Madame Duchesne mentions a picture of that divine object in the sanctuary and a book of "Devotions to the Sacred Heart of Jesus" published in New Orleans. The Ursulines lavished on this holy woman and her five companions the most delicate attentions, and provided them with comforts and even luxuries. On leaving for St. Louis, in July, 1818, the Sacred Heart Sisters received from their generous hostesses a gift of 1500 francs. Almost all the Religious who have since settled in New Orleans have received hospitality and kindness from the Ursuline nuns. They were formerly wealthy and gave freely of their abundance. Poverty was almost unknown in New Orleans before the civil war, from which the Ursulines suffered more severely than any kindred institution. Nor have they yet regained their former prosperity. While the teachers have never lost their high literary reputation, it is sad to think that their pupils are now counted by tens where they were once hundreds.

The archives of this oldest monastery in the United States contain instances of heroism in its early teachers which find their counterparts only in the Lives of the Saints. .

There was Sister Farjon. Born at Avignon of pious parents, she was attracted in girlhood to the pleasures of the world. Being sent at fifteen to the Ursulines, her heart, under their judicious training, turned entirely to God, and she showed the germs of the excellent qualities that blossomed and bore fruit in after life. Her mind was most penetrating, and she worked successfully to overcome the difficulties one experiences at that age whose early education has been neglected. At sixteen she entered the novitiate. Humility and obedience were her favorite virtues and the hidden life of Christ in God her peculiar attraction. Her gayety, her obliging and gentle manners won her the love of all. Her great talent was for teaching the young, whom she made excellent scholars and trained to the practice of solid virtue. She had a strong desire for the foreign mission, and in response to an invitation from the Superioress of New Orleans, made known to her by an old Jesuit who had spent twelve years evangelizing the Indians of lower Louisiana, Sister Xavier, with two young Religious, set out for New Orleans in 1786. Here she divided her attention be-

tween the slaves and the scholars. But it was in the office of Superior, which she held twelve years, that her virtues shone with greatest lustre. To her fell the difficult task of building up the Order after the departure of the Spanish Sisters, in 1803. Like most of the early members, she worked on to the last. Seeing her end approaching, she comforted her sorrowing children, bade them be of good cheer and not leave New Orleans, for God would send them help, which came to pass as she had predicted. She died in the odor of sanctity, March 10th, 1810.

There was Felicité Alzas, who left the world before she knew its vanity and entered the Ursuline Convent, where "she trod the paths of perfection with the steps of a giant." In 1786 she came with two other nuns to the aid of New Orleans from France. The French archives say they were coldly received by the Spanish Ursulines, who placed them in the lowest grade, and even counseled them to return. But this was probably because they could not receive French women without leave of the King of Spain. This was obtained by an old Jesuit friend who, not wishing the New Orleans house to lose such promising subjects, wrote to the Catholic king in their behalf. His Majesty immediately ordered Bishop Cirilo to have them admitted as full members, which was done in November, 1786. If Mother Ramos felt any coldness towards Sister Alzas, it soon vanished, for her natural acuteness showed her what a treasure the house possessed in her. After filling all the other offices, Mother Alzas became Superior in 1827, at the age of seventy-five. Happy by nature as by name, she was all goodness to her daughters, and it was admirable to see her, despite her great age, taking part in all their little amusements. She had a special love for the sick, and might be seen every evening, lantern in hand, visiting them to assure herself they wanted nothing. This holy nun preserved her faculties to the last, and could read the finest print by candlelight without glasses. It is said that she asked and obtained of St. Joachim the grace of never falling into dotage.

The nuns were never weary of extolling the charity and humility of Mother Felicité. Her maternal goodness drew subjects to the house. She loved to replace any Sister that might be absent from a duty, to help at sweeping the dormitory and ironing the clothes. Children and ignorant people had a particular attraction for her. She sacrificed to them her time and her rest. The venerable Mother had great conformity to the will of God. And when several young Religious were describing their ardent desires of perfection, after hearing them patiently, she said: "And I, my children, desire no more love of God, no more of any virtue, than He pleases to give me." To a nun who expressed surprise at her joyousness

under afflictions she said: "For a long time, my daughter, my soul has been established in peace, and nothing can trouble it." Her fifty years' residence in New Orleans had been singularly chequered—she saw the dreadful conflagrations (1788 and 1794) that left thousands homeless; the hurricane that desolated the city in August, 1795; the revolt of the negroes who, excited by the success of the San Domingo revolution, conspired to butcher all the whites in the colony;¹ but worst of all, the schism that all but ruined religion in Louisiana. The death of Charles III. was a loss to the nuns, and it was in their chapel, as the parish church had recently been burned, that grand funeral rites were held in his honor, and a solemn *Requiem* celebrated for the repose of his soul, May 7th, 1789. Like other favored souls, Mother Alzas was tried in many ways, but she joyfully drank the chalice of affliction. In 1796 yellow fever for the first time ravaged the city,² and though the nuns escaped, they had much to suffer from the consequences of the plague. This good mother despised the pains of this life, having her heart set on the glories of eternity. Such was her reputation for sanctity that she was honored at home and abroad, and consulted by many on delicate matters of conscience. She loved to instruct and console the slaves, to whom she was a kind mother. Her last illness lasted but a few hours. She resigned herself entirely into the hands of God. To the Sisters whom she had loved and served so faithfully, she said: "Do as you please with me." She died October 13th, 1835, in the eighty-sixth year of her age, having spent seventy years in religion.

There was the musical Mother de la Clotte, whose songs resound through her sweet story. Born at Montpellier of a highly distinguished family, she was imprisoned during the Revolution, and made herself the slave of her fellow-captives. When set free the fair girl sought to bury her beauty and mental gifts in a cloister, and for this end came to New Orleans in 1789, *via* Baltimore, where Bishop Carroll detained her till December 21st, "on account of the heat." She was specially devoted to the duty of teaching, and though a lover of silence and recollection, she could not bear to be absent from her beloved schools, even when Superior. It was believed that this saintly woman never lost her baptismal innocence. She died after a few days' illness, December 20th, 1827. There was Mother Gensoul, a saintly girl in the world, a saintly nun in the cloister. In 1792 she had to fly; the most stormy years of

¹ After this, the importation of slaves into Louisiana was prohibited, the Cahildo having petitioned the King of Spain to that effect.

² The Intendant, Morales, remarks that the yellow fever selected Flemish, English, and Americans for its victims, and spared Spaniards and blacks. There has never been a case of yellow fever among the Ursulines.

this dark period she spent with her relatives. With another Ursuline, Sophie Ricard, who had been reared a Protestant, but converted by seeing the profession of a nun, she opened a school at Montpellier, and both followed their vocation as well as they could during the Reign of Terror. In 1810 she desired to join the New Orleans Ursulines, now reduced to seven, but her bishop would not allow her. She referred her case to the Pope, who, himself, deigned to calm her perplexity. December 31st, 1810, she reached New Orleans, having been detained over the sickly season in Baltimore by Dr. Carroll. As the nuns heard her carriage lumbering up the narrow street towards their convent, they felt that her coming was a realization of the comforting prophecy of Mother Farjon, just deceased.

The good Mother now resumed the religious habit she had been compelled to put off eighteen years before. Her graciousness and affability charmed every one, particularly the young. She had a tender devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, which was increased by a miraculous dream in which she seemed to see this Heart burning with love for men, adored by angels who were as nothing in His presence; a little above was the Eternal Father under the appearance of an old man. Struck with astonishment, she resolved to paint what she had seen, and the result of her labors was placed within the sanctuary.

Mother Gensoul had a lively devotion to Our Lady of Prompt Succor. Before the battle of New Orleans she made a vow to have a solemn Mass of thanksgiving every year if God would give victory to General Jackson. The statue of Our Lady of Prompt Succor was placed on the altar while Abbé Dubourg offered the Holy Sacrifice to the God of armies, begging Him to deliver the city from the threatened danger. Women and children joined in his supplications; the fathers and sons were all on the battle-field.

To this day a solemn Mass is sung every year in the Ursuline chapel on the 8th of January, which is a legal holiday, and a hymn composed by Mother Gensoul is sung after Mass, "because," say the chronicles, "a great army commanded by generals proud of their ability was cut in pieces, while on the American side six only were killed and seven wounded." Years, sorrows and labors at length told upon the iron constitution of Mother Gensoul. To Bishop Dubourg, who entered the infirmary just before her death, she spoke her last words: "I thirst." "Yes, mother," said he, "but it is for God!" "O God, my God," she murmured, "I thirst for Thee. How lovely are Thy tabernacles! My soul longeth and fainteth after the courts of my God." This apostolic woman, teacher of youth, friend and mother of Indians, negroes, and slaves, passed from earth, March 19, 1822, aged over seventy years.

There were Mothers Coskery, Ray, O'Keeffe, and others; but we must here close the edifying record, merely remarking that Mother O'Keeffe still lives (1887), and though an octogenarian and in failing health, is a most saintly, charming and accomplished woman, with whom it is a treat to converse.

* * * * *

Once, when bound for the bright southern seas, we glided past the lower horn of the river's crescent, in the blaze and brilliancy of noon-tide. The sweet, soft breeze, laden with the odor of lilies, and the aroma of the white-starred orange tree and the pink oleander, scarcely ruffled the glassy waters that reflected the changeful sky. The landscape reposing in the luminous atmosphere was exquisitely peaceful. Rising out of the river, embowered in fresh, green shrubbery, is a huge white pile whose windows innumerable look out on blooming meadows, giant oaks, fields of maize and sugar-cane, mirrored in the yellow river. What bewitching combinations of light and shade, of blue sky, old-gold waters, pale-green leafage and blossoms of every hue. A sylvan paradise, the beauty of which we have no words to depict, surrounds the Ursuline Convent. We have gazed upon the scene when the moon-beams quivered on the foliage, and made fantastic figures as they played among the ancient trees, silvering the whole by their magic touches into dreamy, indescribable loveliness.

How many associations has the Mississippi for the inmates of that convent since it bore their ancestresses in religion to this fertile spot. Where are the gentle Sisters, the ardent priests, the mailed warriors, who came hither with chivalrous promptitude to win souls to the good God? From their belvideres the Religious of to-day can look into the depths of the river on which their predecessors shed such a glamour of poetry and romance. Where are they now? Do the ancient nuns never see phantom-boats guided by the spirits of the great ones of old, moving over its fair bosom in the dusky twilight or the white moonlight?

Alas! all—even the "faithless phantoms," and the pale ghosts, and the fair wraiths, have departed. But the deeds of daring, of brave men, and the gentle virtues of saintly women, and the sweet lights of holiness, have cast a halo around the old place and glorified it forever.

The place remains, while those who gave it undying interest have passed away. Yet the walls still echo sweet children's voices, and the song of the cloistered virgins is heard by angels, if not by men, and the old white monastery looks out forever from its leafy bowers on the eddying, whispering river.

A SKEPTICAL DIFFICULTY AGAINST CREATION.

WE think it may be said with truth that every sort of error, every false theory, every unsound hypothesis has a *point d'appui* of its own, on which all its supposed strength is based, a fulcrum on which it seeks to support its unstable equilibrium. We do not speak of the sources from which it draws its power to mislead humanity, though these might in most cases be reduced to one fountain head, but to the central doctrine which it puts forward in its own justification, the plea which it urges in its own behalf for deserting the standard of dogmatic truth, the ground which it asserts as necessitating its own peculiar form of skepticism. The present day exhibits to us a large proportion of educated men who either have a very confused idea of God or else who do not believe in Him at all. They take their Deity such as He is (or as they suppose He must be), criticise Him, call Him to account, try to force Him into a Procrustes bed of their own construction, attempt to reduce Him to their own standard, and, when they find that He is irreducible, they pass sentence on Him and condemn Him, if not to utter annihilation, at least to banishment out of their sight and ken as a being whose self-contradictory existence they can neither logically admit nor logically deny.

This modern anthropomorphism (often veiled under a protest against its own errors) is but a reproduction of an ancient fallacy, one which Socrates denounced in the Agora, Aristotle in his lectures in the Lyceum, Cicero in his noble treatise "*De Natura Deorum*." Yet our modern skeptics return undismayed to the attack, and courteously, but none the less malignantly, shoot their arrows against the God whom they misrepresent and misconceive. They assert Him a monster because, forsooth, He is not simply a virtuous man on a big scale. They first rob Him of His divinity and then taunt Him with the loss of it. But their error illustrates our assertion of the unity or convergence of the forces of the foe round one single point of attack—one, too, which, we confess at first sight, looks like a vulnerable point in the citadel of truth, or, at all events, like an insoluble difficulty which the champion of truth has to transmit and cannot satisfactorily answer.

What is this difficulty? It is not the prevalence of disease and even death, for they can understand that suffering may be the means of earning an incomparable reward and that death may be the gate of life immortal; it is not the existence of sin, since men

have the sense to understand that if God has given us the fulness of free will, we must perforce be free to disobey as well as free to obey the law He has imposed upon us; it is not even the existence of hell, for it is comparatively easy to see that if the hardened sinner perseveres forever in his rebellion, he must also persist forever in his misery. The central difficulty of our times is none of these, at least primarily, but one which out-tops them all and which is a difficulty not only to the skeptic and to the unbeliever, not only to him who is on the look-out for some excuse for his rebellion, but to all who have ever given it a thought. We will go further, and we will allow that it is a difficulty such as may reasonably frighten us until we look it full in the face and recognize its true character; it is a difficulty which seems insuperable until we have discovered, on thoughtful searching, that it is but a phantom form, a spectre which may be consigned, with all errors, its companions, to the happy hunting grounds of an exploded superstition.

We will try and state this difficulty as forcibly as we can, and put it as some bitter opponent might be supposed to put it. We imagine that in his mouth it would be something as follows: "You say that God is a God of mercy, that He is Himself infinite in mercy. I can understand that the exhibition of this infinite mercy cannot be, strictly speaking, infinite, and that it is limited by the finite nature of those towards whom it is displayed and by the simple fact that outside the Infinite nothing can be infinite. But if it cannot be infinite, yet at least we might expect it to exceed the mercy of a merciful man. We might fancy also that the ideal should exhibit itself in a higher degree and with a greater generosity than is possible to the feeble imitation which does but copy it. We might expect that all that the mercy of man would do, the mercy of God would do also, and a great deal besides. Where a merciful man would have spared, we might have expected that God would spare also. Where a merciful man would have calculated the consequences of this action to the happiness of these so far as he could foresee them, and would have modified his actions accordingly, there we might at least have looked for a similar prevision on the part of an omniscient God and for a corresponding modification of His divine action in favor of those who would be affected by it. Where a merciful man would have held his hand when about to do that which he thought would, so far as he could look forward, involve others in misery and sorrow, there, at least, we might expect the all-merciful God would have abstained from what, in His perfect foreknowledge, He certainly knew would entail upon His creatures ruin and destruction. Yet this merciful God, omnipotent and omniscient, seeing all the future at a glance, know-

ing the destiny of all creatures real and possible, creates hundreds and thousands of unfortunate beings whom He knows full well are destined to be utterly miserable forever. He cannot plead ignorance, carelessness, oversight—since He is God. He cannot urge that as a *Provisor Universalis*, a Ruler who has to think of the general good of the community at large, it was necessary to sacrifice some victims for the sake of the rest, to merge their interest in the consideration of the good of their fellows, since to argue thus, to justify Himself on such a ground, would be to acknowledge His own feebleness; it would be a confession that he was no God at all, but an ἀμήχανος γερδεὶς, a resourceless dotard who has only limited means at His disposal and has to make the best of them. You will tell us, perhaps, that it is always through their own fault that men are lost forever, that they have had sufficient and more than sufficient means for escape from the misery that they have incurred, and that they have only themselves to blame if they have not made use of the opportunities liberally proffered them. This, we allow, is true, but it is no answer to our difficulty. This is a justification of the perfect justice of God, but not of His mercy. You will tell us, again, that if they persist in an attitude of rebellion, even His display of mercy must have a limit somewhere, and the greatest rebel cannot go on defying his God without some limit to the offers of mercy. This also we acknowledge, and we allow that mercy must stop somewhere and leave justice to do its work. But this, too, does not meet our objection, for we are not finding fault with God's treatment of mankind or with His punishment of those who persistently refuse to obey Him. Our difficulty goes a step further back. We ask why He should create at all those whom He knows will, through their own fault, bid Him defiance to the cruel end, reject His mercy, scorn His love, set at nought His commands? Why call them into existence, foreseeing, as He does, their doom of eternal misery? It cannot be for His own sake, for nothing can increase, or diminish, or affect His unapproachable and infinite happiness. It cannot be for their sakes, for the boon of life is destined to be a curse to them. It cannot be for the sake of others, for the misery of some cannot be for Him a necessary condition to the happiness of others. Why, then, should He not leave them in their nothingness, possible but not actual works of His hands, present to the Divine mind as beings whom He might have called into existence, but in His mercy refrained from creating to save them from the guerdon of misery that He knew would be theirs."

We have tried to tell our objector's case as fairly as we could. It looks at first sight a strong one. We confess, when we turn to the answer, we find ourselves a little reluctant to enter upon it. Not that we have any misgivings as to the possibility of a complete and

satisfactory reply. Our reluctance arises from another cause. In the first place, there seems a sort of impertinence in being an apologist for God. When we defend any one, he is our client and we his patron, and it is not a very seemly position to be patronising God. Besides this, the temper of the true Theist is one of humble submission, not of discussion. He is forced, against his will, into the arena to fight the lion and the bear instead of peacefully feeding by the cool waters the sheep and lambs of his Master's flock. His proper business is one of adoring love, not of criticism. There rise to his lips the words of Abraham: "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" and he feels a sort of satisfaction in confessing his ignorance and his inability to solve all difficulties in recognizing that, by reason of his own feebleness, God's judgments are unsearchable and His ways inscrutable. He has such a dread of what is to him the deadly sin of doubt that he shrinks from methodic doubt, which consists in putting himself as far as may be in an adversary's position in order to refute him. Add to this that he has a dread of his own weakness and fears lest the feebleness of his own intellect and his own reasoning powers should damage the indefectible strength of the cause of which he is the champion.

In spite of these drawbacks we are going boldly to make the attempt; and the fallacies underlying our opponents' plausible position are so numerous that there is not very much difficulty in repelling his attacks. The fact is, as we shall show presently, he is an anthropomorphist; from first to last he quarrels with the God of theism because he is not simply a big man. He wants to thrust upon his Creator defects and imperfections which are peculiar to the creature, to drag him down to his own level; and because God is consistent, asserts His proper position as Lord and King of the Universe, and refuses any perfections incompatible with infinity, the objector most unreasonably quarrels with Him, refuses to acknowledge Him, calls Him a cruel tyrant, or the great unknowable, even if he does not altogether deny His existence, and buries himself in the slough of a degrading atheism. Thus, for instance, when he requires the exhibition of the divine mercy to be at the best on a level with that displayed by the most merciful of men, he is at once putting on the cloak of his anthropomorphist hypothesis. For God, the infinitely good, is under no sort of obligation to display His goodness at all, whereas man is required, by precept and counsel, to carry out into practice the goodness which exists in his heart. It is true that God's attribute of mercy is the source, the foundation, the basis of His display of mercy. "*Bonum est diffusivum sui*," good of all kinds, divine as well as human, has a tendency to spread itself beyond itself. In

man's case it *must* do so, in God's case there is no absolute necessity, only a sort of fitness and conformity with what we should naturally and reasonably expect. If God were simply to measure out to each man bare justice without mercy, man would have no right to complain, and God would none the less be infinite in mercy. The supposition is practically almost an impossible one, because God, knowing the weakness of our nature, and how necessary concrete examples are to enable us to realize abstract truths, would not, and we may perhaps say, could not, reasonably require of us that we should believe in a divine attribute which never manifested itself to us, and of which there was not a trace in His dealings with men. But the supposition is, theoretically, possible, and we can suppose God measuring out to men exact justice and nothing more, tempering His justice with no admixture of mercy, giving to each what is due to him in the way of pleasure, happiness, satisfaction, enjoyment, reward, temporal or eternal, forgiveness for the past and help for the future, but nothing whatever beyond his due. If He did so, we should still be bound to believe him a God of infinite love. Every display of mercy to man is quite gratuitous on God's part, and, consequently, the measure of it depends on His will, and is subject to no law except His supreme and inscrutable will. It is not so with His justice. He must, *ipso facto*, from His very nature be perfectly just; but perfect mercy is an expression that cannot, from the nature of things, have any realization in facts, and the amount of mercy shown to each must be now more, now less, without our being able to lay down any sort of rule. God may display none of it, as we have said; He may display comparatively little of it, justice so preponderating that mercy is thrown into the background, as in His punishment of the lost. He may display it, and in fact He does display it, in such luxuriant profusion that He appears almost extravagant in His readiness to overlook evil, sin, treachery, baseness, ingratitude; almost reckless in the magnificent rewards He showers upon one who has made some faint, puny efforts to serve Him, as where He rewards man's brief service here with the immeasurable and eternal joys of heaven. But the amount of mercy shown, whether it be less or more, or none at all, in no way affects the inherent infinity of the divine goodness, loving with an infinite love that which is worthy of such love, and with a finite love that which, by reason of its finite nature, is capable of only a finite love.

Thus it is that the essential difference between God and man comes prominently before us. Man is bound to show mercy over and above justice—not so God. Man, if he aims at perfection, must impart to others the fulness of mercy to the very best of his power. God cannot put forth outside of Himself the fulness of

any of His internal perfections. Man's mercy is developed by its exercise, and, therefore, he who strives after perfection must exert it to the utmost limit of his power. God's mercy is in no way affected by its external exercise, and He cannot exert it to the limit of His power because His power of exerting it has no limits. We have a right to judge of the amount of man's mercy by the amount that we see of it. We cannot judge of the amount of the Divine mercy by the amount that we see of it, simply because the amount we see must, from the nature of the case, be a finite amount, whereas the mercy itself is infinite, and there is, therefore, no sort of proportion between the one and the other. Hence, it is no argument in favor of God acting in this way rather than in that, that the one course of action is more merciful than the other. If it were, why should God ever punish at all? Why should He not always influence men with gifts of virtue instead of frightening them from evil with threatened punishments?

We have dwelt upon this because it is so dangerous and plausible a fallacy to demand of God a sort of maximum amount of mercy and generosity. As a matter of fact, He is almost lavishly merciful and generous, but there is no sort of reason founded on His possession of these attributes why He should display them beyond the point which is necessary to show man that He possesses them. Beyond this all is gratuitous.

To apply this to our subject. In God's dealings with men we see many cases in which He might have given more than He has. More than this, there is no single individual whom He might not have endowed more richly; no saint in heaven whom He might not have given, had He chosen, larger graces than He has given. This follows necessarily from His being God and not man, infinite in His treasures of grace, not finite. It is, therefore, for Him, and Him alone, to draw the line between bare justice on the one side and unbounded mercy on the other; all we have a right to ask of God is that He shall be perfectly just to all—that He shall give to each individual whom He creates a fair chance of attaining to eternal happiness. When He has given this, when each is provided with such means of grace, such opportunities, such assistance, internal and external, in the way of virtue, that it is not only barely possible, but well within his power to find his way to heaven, to avoid sin and practise virtue, then God has done His part, and even if through their own neglect of those opportunities all but a few, a very few, of the human race were lost, we should have no kind of right to complain against God, to impugn His justice or even to impugn His mercy. As long as every one of the lost is bound to cry out, "It was through my own fault that I was lost," so long God is justified, and His infinite perfections would be in themselves

none the less admirable than if they had all been saved. His works are not a whit more perfect when He gives more grace, shows more mercy, than when He gives less grace and shows less mercy. If He had pursued the lost with graces which they could not resist, He would be not a whit more merciful than He is now in giving them grace enough, and more than enough, to enable each one of them to save his soul, though unfortunately for them not enough, by reason of their own perverse will, to overturn their deliberate resistance to the gentle influence which persuades, invites, attracts, but never compels. Deny this and you at once degrade God to a finite being, for you imply that He is bound to go to the full extent of His mercy-extending powers; and an infinite God, as having no possible limit in any of His powers, cannot go to their full extent, and, therefore, will be, and must be, always liable to the plausible objection that He, the All-Merciful, might have been more merciful, and yet would not! Paradoxes are sometimes true, and we allow that at first sight it seems a paradox to justify God's limited distribution of mercy by the fact that His supply of it is unlimited; but the logical fact is undeniable. For it stands to reason that He must draw a line somewhere, and wherever He draws it He might always have given more; and our anthropomorphist can object that He cannot be a God of infinite mercy and compassion because of this limitation of what He might give more liberally if He chose.

Here we must guard against a misconception. Good men and good Christians sometimes talk as if the reason why God's manifestation of any one of His perfections is limited, is because some other perfection comes in to place a bar to its further display, that God's anger is limited by His mercy, His mercy by His justice, and so forth. They regard the divine action as the resultant of these various attributes determining and even counteracting one another. Such an idea is, we will not say false, but very imperfect; we may say, in metaphorical language, that the arm that was raised to punish was stayed by the remembrance of mercy; we may pray to God to remember His loving kindness, to call to mind His servants of old, as we often find the Hebrew prophets doing when misfortunes threatened the sacred city of Jerusalem; we may ask that mercy may rejoice against His justice; but in all this we are using human language, which, in the very use we know, is but a *façon de parler*, a mode of addressing the Most High, which represents our weakness and feebleness better than His Divine Majesty. There is not, and cannot be, any sort of opposition between one attribute of God and another; nay, there is no real difference or distinction in themselves between one and another. It is true that there is in each and every attribute of God, by reason of its in-

finitude, a *foundation* for a real distinction in our minds between one and the other, just as in the colorless light of the sunbeam there is a sort of foundation for the distinction between the various colored rays into which it separates when it passes through the prism. But in the attributes *themselves* there is no real distinction or difference. God is identical with all His attributes, and, therefore, all these attributes are identical with each other. God's mercy, justice, love, holiness, etc., are really all one and the same thing; the distinction is in us, not in God, in our way of looking at them, not in the perfections themselves. When we say that God acts sometimes in justice, at other times in mercy, we mean that the side of the Divine action which is present to our minds is what we call justice or what we call mercy; there is no real distinction, no difference *ex parte rei*, between these two actions, which to us seem to stand in such marked contrast; or, to speak more correctly, the distinction which we perceive, and truly perceive, is the result rather of the different objects which are the terminus of the divine action. The same ray of light is red or blue according to the object on which it falls; the same indivisible act of God, ever perfect in its unity, appears to us in the light of anger or of love, according to the disposition of the man on whom it is directed, and partly according to the apparent and immediate consequences by which men are always prone to judge. If God sends the Deluge, we regard it as a punishment pure and simple, as a display of God's wrath; we watch the reprobate world swallowed up by the rising waters, and we see no mercy in the awful visitation. But we know that many of those who then perished turned their hearts to God before their death; that though they had been incredulous as long as the ark was preparing, and had jeered at Noe's patient and apparently aimless labor, yet they had repented with contrite hearts when the flood-gates were opened, and that they were visited by our Lord after His death, who deigned to preach to them and prepare them for the eternal joys of Heaven. For them, therefore, the Deluge was a supreme act of mercy. So, too, it may be that, besides the handful of just men who escaped from Sodom, there may have been grievous sinners not a few, who made hearty acts of sorrow for all their evil deeds, when the agony of the falling fire flakes and the sulphurous suffocating storms reminded them of the punishment in store for those who set at naught the natural law. For these, therefore, the brief amount of expiating anguish would be a supreme mercy, an act of Divine compassion. We bring forward these instances, not so much by way of showing man's shortsighted way of looking at things Divine, but to show how the same action of God is determined in its character by the recipient; in just the same way the eternal punish-

ment of the wicked is as real mercy to those who are led by the consideration of it to avoid that which is worse than any possible punishment, the hideous, loathsome thing we call sin.

But we must return to our immediate subject. We have been seeking to prove that God must limit His mercy from the very nature of the case, and that if it is more merciful not to create this or that man than to create him, it does not follow that God will abstain from bringing him into being as long as the man is not exposed by the fact of his creation, the circumstances of his birth, to any sort of injustice. God's own nature forbids the faintest or slightest injustice, but the amount of mercy to be shown is not and cannot be proportionate to the Divine perfection, but must be determined simply and solely by the Divine will. Even though the man is born to misery and dies in sin, his creation and his career imply no sort of imperfection in God so long as he has a reasonable chance of making his own way to heaven at last. Such a chance God gives to every one, a good, reasonable chance and something more; and man's ultimate fate, if he is lost, is simply owing to his misuse of the free will God has given him, and his abuse of the graces by which God helped him on his way.

Perhaps, however, our opponents are not satisfied with this solution. We allow, they say, that God's mercy must *ipso facto* be limited; but why should He not so fix the limit that none should be miserable forever, but all should at least be on the right side of the Judge at last? Why should He not so limit His creatures' action that none should be brought into being except those who will love and praise Him to all eternity, and not those whom He in His infinite prescience knows will forever gnaw their tongues and curse their Maker for creating them? If, continues our opponent, God's supreme majesty is not affected by the fate of His creatures, He might at least have given them what cost Him nothing: if it is the divine glory which must needs be manifested, surely the praises of the blessed are a more congenial manifestation than the curses of the lost. Why should He not have limited Himself to the creation of those to whom it will be better to be than not to be, of those predestined to at least some degree or other, greater or less, of everlasting happiness? Here we are at the very kernel of the difficulty in the form in which it strikes the popular imagination with the greatest force. It certainly is hard at first to understand what appears to be a gratuitous act of cruelty on the part of the All-Merciful. But let us look a little closer into the matter, and we shall see that the alternative of mercy which our objectors would suggest as an improvement on the existing order is simply a plea for the same degrading anthropomorphism in another form—it is the same short-sighted, feeble

argument—which would fashion a God after its own fancies that would be no God at all. For the method of action which it proposes as suitable to God is this. Objecting to His creating any one whom He foresees will be lost, it requires of Him that when He is going to create such a one He should stop short and hold His creative hand. Now this supposes on the part of God, in the course of the series of acts succeeding one another in the divine mind,—not, of course, in time, but in logical order,—a positive, actual deliberation before adopting one or other of them. It supposes God to conceive the idea of creating A and of giving him a certain amount of grace, and then to look forward to the results before putting His ideas in practice. It supposes Him to foresee that A will be lost, and foreseeing this, to put aside the idea of his creation, and to create B instead, whom He by a similar process of prevision foresees will be saved. God would have to confess that the idea conceived, the realization of which would be the creation of A, was an unfortunate one, and would have to fall back on some one more suitable to the Divine bounty. Now God in contemplating the future has before Him every imaginable result which would have followed from every possible contingency. There is mapped out clearly in the Divine mind the whole course of the world's history as it would have been if our first parents had not sinned, or if the deluge had not submerged the habitable world, or if Christ had come into the world a thousand years earlier or later, or if Xerxes had made himself master of Greece or Hannibal of Italy, or if the Protestant "Reformation" had not taken place, or if Napoleon the Great had never been born or had died in childhood or in youth. All this, with its remotest consequences to the end of time, stands out sharp and clear before the mind of God. Nay, God sees what would have been the history of each individual man if he had been subject to influences different from those which he has actually experienced—if, for instance, he had been born in China or Japan instead of in England or in France; if he had been reared among savages or Mahometans, if he had been an orphan from his infancy, if he had been rich instead of poor, low-born instead of high-born, if one or many or all the circumstances of his life had been changed; each separate result, with all the innumerable results which would have branched off from it, is foreseen by the Divine Omniscience in His infinite storehouse of possibilities. But all these things which might have taken place, yet never did take place, are simply possibilities and nothing more. When God has once stamped them with the mark of possibility pure and simple, no person in heaven or on earth can change them into actualities. God Himself cannot reverse His decree, cannot change His mind, and rescue out of the abyss of things which

might have been but are not to be, what He has once regarded as a pure possibility. We cannot picture God as placing before Himself, over and above actualities and possibilities, that third class which is continually present to human intelligence, the class of contingencies, of things which are still undecided, and which may or may not be things about which we are not sure and respecting which, if it is in our power to bring them to pass or not to bring them to pass, we have not made up our minds. Any one can see that it is an absurdity to suppose a God who has not made up His mind respecting some action which He is contemplating—nothing can be more ludicrous than to picture Him as turning the matter over before He decides, or looking forward to the consequences of His action before He makes the contingent actual. Yet this is what our objectors propose in the Deity whom they desire to substitute for the Omnipotent and Infinite God of Theism—they want to set up a stupid old man who does not know his own mind, who makes mistakes, and afterwards is sorry for them, who proposes to create one man, but on looking forward to the unfortunate consequences of the act of creation, or foreseeing by means of His Omniscience that the poor fellow will through his own fault be lost, puts aside the idea conceived in the Divine intelligence and creates another instead whom He foresees will save his soul. There is something almost amusing in this improvement on the God of Theism that the inconsequent skeptic proposes to set up in His place. This new Divinity, more perfect than His predecessor, is to revolutionize the mode of managing the world—the old gods of paganism are replaced by the God of the Christian, their voices are silent and they belong to the past. And now He who succeeded to their place is gone, having encountered one mightier than Himself.¹

The method of procedure which God is to adopt is as follows, according to our intelligent objector. First of all, He is to conceive the idea of creating A, then He is to exercise His power of prevision in order to discover what A's eternal destiny will be. If A proves a success and reaches heaven, then all is well. God may be allowed to create him. But if he proves a failure, if, in spite of all the chances given him, the graces bestowed on him, the warnings, threatenings, chastisements, he will persist in rebellion till the end of his probation, if he will defy God and refuse to submit to Him, then God must draw back from His abortive design. He must cry, "I made a mistake! I certainly intended

¹ Cf. *Æsch. Ag.* 168–71.

οὐδ' ὅστις πάροιθεν ἦν μέγας
οὐδὲν ἂν λέξαι πρὶν ὧν
ὅς δ' ἔπειτ' ἔφυν τριακτῆρος δίχεται τυχῶν.

to create A, but I see now that my work would have been a failure. Forgive me this once. I will try to turn out a more successful specimen of humanity in my next attempt; if I do not, if I am again unfortunate in my endeavor, I can but once more apologize for my abortive design, before I have launched upon the world of actuality another being destined to perish. I will go on putting before myself possible beings one after another, till I am so fortunate as to hit upon one whom I foresee will be saved, and then, and then only, will I issue the definitive fiat of creation!"

When put thus barely, the absurdity of the objection is clear enough. But, unfortunately, we in our conceit and pride

See not the feeble incapacity
Like to a dream, in which poor purblind man
Lies wrapt and bound. Never can mortal's scheme
O'erpass the harmony ordained by Heaven's King.

God does not and cannot create this or that individual with a view to the consequences of creation destined to ensue from his obedience or disobedience to the law of his nature. He cannot do so without forfeiting the supremacy of His divine perfection. God creates because the creative act is in itself good, and the being created is good, and the end for which he is created is good, as regards the Divine intention, though, through the free will which belongs to him necessarily as man, he can frustrate that intention and fail of attaining to that end. It would be degradation to God to require of Him that He should look forward to what will be in point of fact the termination of that individual's career, shaped as it will be by the act of the created being, and that He should regulate His divine action by the foreseen whims and perversities and sins and rebellions of the creature. He cannot be tied down to make or abstain from making according to these contingent consequences without thereby ceasing to be, in the mind of him who would impose such an obligation, a being of infinite wisdom; for by this necessity of reason He would exhibit Himself, not as one that doeth all things well, but as a clumsy workman, an unskilful and inconsiderate craftsman, a bungling designer of his own handiwork.

Even man is not bound to look forward, and sometimes is bound not to look forward to the consequences which he may foresee will result or are likely to result from this or that action. If we knew that a million souls would be lost by our refusal to tell a lie in a

¹ οὐδ' ἐδεῖχθη
ὀλιγοῦραντιαν ἄκικον
ἰσόνειρον ἃ τὸ φωτῶν
ἀλαθὺν γένος ἐμπεποδιομένον; οὐποτε θλατῶν
τὰν Διὸς ἁρμονίαν ἀνδρῶν παρεξίασι βοῶλαί.—*Ksch. Crom.*, 545-51.

case where there was a clear obligation to truth, the ruin which the sinful lie might avert would not be any justification for telling it. "*Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum.*" We must perform our obligations, even if all the inhabitants of Paradise were to be thrown down into the flames of hell by our own persistency. It is only when the performance or non-performance of the action is itself indifferent, or, at all events, is not essentially bad, that we can perform it or not, according to the consequences we foresee from it. If we foresee that by reproving a blasphemer we have a chance of bringing him to a better state of mind, then we shall do well in taking on ourselves the charitable but painful task of reprimand. But if, on the other hand, we foresee that it will probably only lead to fresh blasphemies, then we had better hold our tongues. If we foresee that the action, in itself indifferent, of walking down a particular street will lead us to a tempting gin palace, into which we know from long experience that we are certain to enter, and having entered to drink to excess, then we are bound to turn our feet, if it be possible, in some other direction. If we foresee that by retiring to the chapel to pray we shall annoy and irritate our father, who wishes us to pass the time in reading to him some harmless and entertaining story, then it is far better to set aside the peaceful communing with God for an employment which, however inferior in itself, has the superior claim from the fact that it will amuse and satisfy the old man's fancies.

But this duty of prevision is the consequence of the subordinate position which we occupy in creation; it is because our actions derive their character from their conformity with, or disagreement from, the commands of a superior who has a right to command, that we are bound to forecast and see whether they will tend to the carrying out of His will, or to a transgression of His laws. But the irresponsible superior is not so bound—cannot be so bound. He cannot, indeed, transgress the perfection of His own nature. He cannot do anything which is of itself unjust, unmerciful, unkind. But, outside of this, no other condition can be imposed on Him consistently with a recognition of His God-head. We cannot, consistently with His position as King and Lord, ask of Him a prevision of consequences, when these consequences derive their painful character from the fault of the subordinate agent, and not from any law which the Creator has imposed upon the creature. We cannot even admit that such consequences influence or determine His divine action. What God does is good, because God does it; what God makes is good, because God makes it. It is the exercise of the Divine Will, supreme, omnipotent, irresponsible, which confers upon the external act or work its perfection, inasmuch as it is in virtue of its being the act or work of a God,

an inadequate reflection of His divine beauty which manifests itself more or less in it. Nay, it is not only good, but best, nay, the best thing possible, simply because God wills it, and wills by it to promote His glory just in that degree which shall seem good to Him. If it is God's will that some event should take place by which His glory should be promoted to an extent which we may formulate as 10, then it is far better that this event should come about than that some other event of which the consequences might be formulated as 100, or 1000, or 10,000, or 1,000,000. It is better that the being created by God should glorify God in the way which is in accordance with His supreme will, rather than in some other way not in accordance with His supreme will, but which is, nevertheless, to speak in human fashion, more fruitful of glory to God. It is better that a little child should gasp out its little soul after an hour of life, if such is the Divine decree, than that it should serve God and promote His glory during fourscore years of unbroken fidelity, if God has not so ordained. It is better that a man should be created whom God foresees (permitting, not willing, the sin) is about to spend his life in an unbroken course of transgression and disobedience and rebellion against the Divine Law, if God's will is to create him, than that a future saint should come into existence under any other circumstances; otherwise the will of God will not be the supreme law of the universe and the fulfilment of His divine pleasure the pattern of all perfection, the standard, the ideal, the sum and substance of all that is good and to be desired outside of His own divine nature. Otherwise you degrade God, compel Him to modify His arrangements by reason of human perversity, exhibit Him in the ridiculous and impossible character of a short-sighted, clumsy designer, a master-builder who foresees that the design he has conceived will fail of its end, and so abandons it.

From this another consequence follows, that there is no such thing as a failure in God's creation. The creation of those who are lost forever is no more a failure than the existence of some rare and gorgeously painted butterfly is a failure because, forsooth, it has scarcely escaped from its chrysalis stage when it is caught in the tropical forest by some eager collector, and sacrificed to adorn the museum of some far-off city. Those who are condemned to the eternal punishment of hell, fail, it is true, of the vision of God; they fail of the only thing in the world which renders life worth living; they fail of the end for which He destined them apart from any action of their own which should frustrate it. They fail of virtue, they fail of that which alone can satisfy the yearnings of their higher nature, they fail of the only fount of happiness which can slake their thirst after God. But their life, though a failure in

regard of themselves, is not a failure in respect of God. It would be no more a failure in the eyes of an unprejudiced looker on—say an angel watching the scene—than the short-lived existence of the moth adorning the collector's museum is a failure in the eyes of any intelligent man. For the ultimate end of human existence, the ultimate reason why man is born into the world, is not his own happiness, nor the attainment of that which is to him the only centre in which his activity can find repose, nor the brilliant display of human virtue, nor even the service and praise of God, but the manifestation of the Divine attributes in a greater or less degree, in this way or that, according as God shall please. It is because God necessarily receives an accidental glory from all His dealings with His creatures that these creatures were primarily created. From His rational creatures God derives the greatest glory, whether they obey or rebel, whether their relation to Him is one of submission or revolt, still God is glorified, He is glorified by the punishment of the rebel as well as by the reward of the saint. If the latter is a more brilliant manifestation of the Divine glory than the former, we must remember that God is never tied *ad optimum*. One man freely submits, and his relation to God is one of honor and praise, and a crown of eternal joy; another freely rebels, and his relation to God is one of dishonor and contempt, and the agony of an eternal separation from all good—in each case God receives the honor that is His due. In each case the creation, the life, nay, the eternal destiny of man is a success as far as God is concerned, because it manifests one or other of the Divine perfections. There is no such thing as a failure in God's universe, and there cannot be.

But here we fancy our objector replies: "Granting all you say, granting that human existence is a success as regards God Himself; granting, too, that if He creates rational beings at all, He must create them free to choose their own ruin, if their perverse self-will refuses to bend the knee to God; granting, also, that God cannot from the very necessity of His divine nature hark back on His own designs and abstain from the creation of those whom He foresees will be lost; still, *why should God create at all?* It makes no difference, you tell us, to the unapproachable and supreme happiness of God whether He creates or not. Why, then, should He embark on a work which brings to Him no profit and plunges into the misery of eternal fire hundreds, thousands, millions, of the creatures He professes to love?"

We have, we fear, outrun the length to which we intended to limit the present article, and we must therefore postpone to some future time the solution of this further difficulty. But we have already furnished the intelligent reader with at least one key to it.

For if God cannot be required, consistently with His divine perfection, to regulate and modify His creative action by the consequences which follow from it, how absurd and self-contradictory it is on the very strength of these Divine perfections to exact of Him to abstain from creating altogether. If the beings created were involved in eternal misery without any fault of their own, we could understand the difficulty of creation, but when they of their own free will simply reject the happiness offered them—how utterly unreasonable to require of God that He should be baffled of the creative act, good in itself and tending to good, because, forsooth, the being created chooses to turn the good wine to poison, to use the means given him for the attainment of eternal happiness in order to purchase for himself eternal misery. Unreasonable, then, it would be, and self-contradictory; and, as we hope we may show hereafter, unmerciful as well.

To go back to the difficulty which we stated at the opening of the present paper: No one can assail the justice of God in that He creates those whom He foresees will, through their own fault, be lost; no one can assail the degree of mercy which He exercises towards them without first robbing Him of His divine nature. No one can ask Him to abstain from creating them without falling into the same absurdity of substituting for an Infinite God one who is finite and subordinate. No one can reasonably demand of God that He should contradict Himself. Yet this is what the objector virtually demands of Him, and when he refuses to accede to a demand which is in contradiction with His divine nature, the unreasonable and purblind mortal threatens to withdraw his allegiance from his Creator, and exclaims in the words of a modern infidel: "Such a God I cannot and will not obey."

MORE ABOUT SURNAMES AND THEIR MUTATIONS.

THERE is an old proverb which says very truly: "It is a poor business to look at half-done work;" and, though this "saw" be less than usually applicable to the work before us, we have yet deemed it desirable to continue the remarks on proper names, accidentally begun a few months ago, and at that time carried as far as the letter K of a meagre Directory serving as text for the observations made. In the course of search for another book of the same sort, we learned with certainty what *a priori* reasoning had already rendered probable, *vis.*, that those Directories are mere individual ventures on speculation; that it is with their compilers neither a question of fulness nor of accuracy; that the prominent notion is to get off with the least pains and trouble, and that, the advertisements and the paying names in capitals being once secured, the rest is looked upon as mere filling to be copied from a previous Directory, or put in pretty much at random. In the case of such a book as a Directory, in its nature calculated for a particular city and vicinity, indeed expecting no patronage elsewhere, limited, moreover, to the demands of a single year, the harm done by its incompleteness or inaccuracy is very slight, and the legal saying, "caveat emptor," will very rightly apply. No city, however small, can in this country be happy without several daily papers and a weekly or two, in which, following the example of our publishing purveyors of literature on a larger scale, the insertion of a few advertisements procures "puffs" corresponding to the amount realized therefrom, and our Directory-maker has gained his end. If the system were confined within such bounds, we should say of it that it is a comparatively harmless, but real, fraud. Yet the same legerdemain is carried on through our whole system of book-making and book-publishing. Publishers well know that a name, a reputation, real or false, merited or the reverse, is what will take with the community; their object is to sell; they can directly or indirectly control the press, herald in advance a work as about to appear, and as the *very best* of its kind; as appearing finally; and leaving nothing to be desired; as having been published and applauded by the most competent judges,—and, if under such persistent pressure old stagers in literature are often deceived into the purchase of an utterly or nearly worthless but well-puffed book, how very natural, is it not, that the masses should be bamboozled into buying, reading, and even praising works of no intrinsic or

extrinsic merit. This matter has been reduced to a system, in which the publishers are the rooks and the public the pigeons to be plucked. Worst of all is this system in the matter of school-books, the sufferers by them being so eminently helpless. "Hordes of text-books succeeding each other like the Goths and Vandals, series of readers, geographies, grammars and arithmetics 'six-deep' and graded till gradation is a misnomer, leaves the whole country at the mercy of publishers whose interests demand the most books at the highest price for the least number of children."

However, we have in this article to do with surnames, having been told that the subject is worthy of our continuance, and we shall consequently give a few of the more salient instances in which ignorance or vanity has caused them to suffer a sea-change. When the resultant change is the effect of simple illiteracy, the mode of transition is readily intelligible and the effect produced merely *new*; but when pretence goes to work for the purpose of embellishing a name, the offspring is apt to be both *new* and *strange*. Again we repeat that there is no intention to present an abstruse treatise on the etymology of names, for we touch their origin only when it is rendered necessary to prove the kinship of two apparently distinct forms. We confine ourselves to these facts: 1st. That many and useless varieties exist in the writing of a large majority of surnames. 2d. That they never ought to have existed, and were caused by illiteracy or vanity. 3d. That they need reform as much as did the orthography of the ordinary vocables of our tongue in the days when we spelled most loosely.

The word *Ceannuidhe* means in Irish "merchant," and we find in all languages surnames of like signification. They may be *Chapman*, *Kaufmann*, *Marchand*, *Mercatore*, or whatever else as to sound, but the meaning is always the same, and such name was originally given to some ancestor of those bearing it to-day, because he kept what we in the United States call a *store* and the English a *shop*. The Celtic word gives us such various forms of one name, as *Kennedy*, *Canaday*, *Canday*, *Kenney*, *Kennie*, *Kinney*, etc., which we submit as not all worthy of allowance and retention. Of course, we must grant that the Erse orthography is still so very loose that it hardly deserves the name; but, indeed, that of all the modern literary languages was for centuries in an almost equally dubious condition; proof of this assertion is by no means referred to the days of MSS. (manuscripts), but may be seen in earlier printed works of the various European languages, all and each found very shaky in the matter of spelling until near the close of the last century. We insist, then, that a clearly significant name should never be mutilated, as even in the instance before us, though it is by no means one of the worst cases of atrocious usage. If

our best authorities have deemed it proper, nay, even necessary, that we retain the silent letters in such words as *doubt*, *stalk*, *knee*, *indict*, etc., lest otherwise we lose sight of the derivation of these words; nay, if we actually do retain the original spelling of such surnames as *Cholmondeley*, *Taliaferro*, *Marjoribanks*, *Auchinleck*, *Colclough*, etc., while we pronounce them as *Chumly*, *Tolliver*, *Marchbanks*, *Affleck*, *Cokcly*, etc., there would seem to be no good reason why the rule should not be made uniform and enforced for *all* proper names. Our surnames are not outlaws from the community of language. They are nearly all even yet significant to the ear of an intelligent and tolerably instructed observer; and few, if any, fail to disclose their original meaning to him who has mastered the tongue of their origin. But this will not long continue to be the case if those who drive amongst them persist in so doing with the loose rein to which they have inured themselves. If words be things, as to which assertion philologists are pretty well agreed, or even though they be but signs, whether one or the other, they ought to have some better safeguard than they have when they take service as proper names, in which case they seem to be practically without the purview whether of grammar or dictionary, and are left to the caprice of their masters.

In the case of the name before us, the desirability of a change in the initial letter is very evident, but it is by no means so apparent that any further change in the orthography of the radical Celtic word was needed, or is now, for edification.

What can possess a man whose name is *Cathcart* (Fair-fight),—a name distinguished both in politics and literature—to transmute it into such a misnomer as *Kithcart*, a name both without authority and derivation? *Kalk* means in German *lime*, and is a not infrequent surname in the Fatherland; but in this region of country it has been deformed into *Calk*, *Colk*, *Kolck*, and even into *Kollock*.

Some names beginning with the syllable *Kil* are properly enough derived from the original speech of the Scotch Highlands, which, though in essence the same with the Erse, or the Irish, yet differs in many words, as well as in general, by a closer, or as Horne Tooke called it, a more *obstructed* pronunciation. The *Gilpatrick* of the Irishman becomes in the dialect of the Highlander *Kilpatrick*. But, as the Irish form of the tongue is the only one having either *nisus* or signs of ancient cultivation, we are clearly of opinion that all the numerous names derived from *Gille*—a *servant*—should be written and printed in accordance with the superior form of the language. Hence *Gilroy*, *Gilray*, *Gilrea* and *Gilree* (servant of the king), *Gildea*, *Gilday*, *Guildee* (servant of God), *Gilkirk* and *Gilchrist* (which explain themselves) should not be spelled with K. Of course it is evident that *Gilham*, *Gillum*, *Gillam* and *Gillem* are

a single Saxon name, and that *Gillis*, *Gillies* and *Giles* should all be written in one form.

It must be admitted that the part of *pedissequus* is not one of high honor, unless, indeed, one happens to occupy that position in the service of royalty, or what is in Europe denominated "high nobility," in either of which cases there are evidently minds so constituted that its meniality becomes to them dignified, and they incline to boast of such servitude. But if one's name be *Lackey*, the origin remains, even though he call himself *Lecky*, *Lackie*, *Lickey* or *Lick*. For the sundry forms *Lachlan*, *Lacklan*, *Lacklin*, *Lacklon*, etc., there are but two possible origins: *Lackland* (sans terre), the sobriquet of King John of England, and the *Loghlin* or *Lachlan* of the Celts, which latter most assuredly stands as the progenitor of all the *McLachlans*, it matters not how they may letter a name; their ingenuity in misspelling is only equalled by their prolific qualities. The populace in our own country insist on calling a celebrated French patriot *Lay-fay-ette*, and too many, who should know better, seem inclined to follow them therein; but there is not even a plausible reason why *Mr. La Motte* should go out of his way, as he does, in calling himself *Mr. Lamotte*; and we suppose they must be kinsmen of his who, a little further on, give their names respectively as *Laymot* and *Laymut*.

Leahy, *Leahy*, *Lahy*, *Lahy* and *Lay* are but different modes of writing one name, the first written being the correct form. And the name of that saint who was roasted on a gridiron is offered us under the motley forms *Laurence*, *Lawrence*, *Lawrance*, *Lawrens*, *Lorrens*, *Lorence*, to say nothing of the German *Lorenz* and the French *Laurent*. Whether as a simple name or as the termination of a compound, there would seem to be no reason for retaining *Lee* or *Leigh*, seeing we have long ceased to use any but *lea* as the form of the common noun from which they do not differ save in being used for this specific purpose. But among the many hundred names to which we find this termination tacked, there is, we think, specially good cause for referring to a common standard such absurdities as *Atley*, *Atlee*, *Atleigh*, *Otley*, *Otleigh*, *Utlee*, *Utley*, *Utleigh*, which collectively are but variations, and mostly stupid ones, of the distinctive name given to that particular *Hob* who was distinguished from others of the same Christian name by his place, or farm, which was "*atte leyc*." Every uneducated man who sees or hears the proper name *Leech* (which is of very common occurrence with us) straightway imagines, if he thinks at all on the subject, that it is connected with the leech used for depleting the veins; whereas a slight knowledge of old English, to say nothing of Anglo-Saxon, convinces us that it is but the name given by our ancestors to a physician, and in truth it has been most absurdly

supplanted in the common parlance of their descendants by the term *doctor*, utterly inappropriate because so dubious that it has become non-descriptive. Of this name, written in Saxon in three different forms, the most frequent is that exemplified in the text: "*Nys halum laccas nan thearfi*,"—*they who are whole (sound) need not a physician* (St. Matt. ix., 12). But we find in present use *Leech*, *Leach*, *Leache*, *Leitch*, *Leitch* and *Leitsh*.

Lyke, *Leake*, *Lykman*, *Likename*, *Licknam*, *Licknum* and *Lynam* are but the Saxon and Teutonic name for a corpse; and while one might, as a matter of taste, prefer a name not recalling such dismal ideas, yet, if actually afflicted with such a surname, he would, if a sensible man, choose rather that all the family should spell it, if not *aright*, at least *alike*.

Whether *Layman* was so called from his not being a *cleric* or from his inability to read (both of which suppositions seem unlikely at a time when the great body of the people were altogether uneducated), or from the more likely though more disreputable word *Leman*, he certainly did not get his name from the fruit, and so should never write the word *Lemon*; yet we find in the Directory, not only these forms, but also *Lamon* and *Lamond*.

The man who spells his name *Lennard*, *Lennert*, *Linnard* and *Linard* when he is rightly named *Leonard*, need not laugh at his neighbors on the next column whose real name is *Leopard*, but who call themselves *Lappard*, *Leppart*, *Lippard*, *Lippart*, *Lipperd* and even *Lippett*. Probably there can be nothing done to change the originally very absurd practice of putting *Lewis* down for the original *Louis*, but *Leves* is an utter abomination, palliable on no grounds that can be adduced.

In how many ways do not our friends who deem themselves hurt by the name *Little*, try to disguise or escape the obnoxious signification! *Littel*, *Littell*, *Liddel*, *Liddell*, *Lytle*, *Lytelle*, etc., are but a few of the *ruses* to which they have recourse; but they are all in vain, the meaning of the name under any guise being just the same with the Gaelic *Beggs*, *Biggs*, *Boggs*, the Cambrian *Vaughans*, the Teutonic *Kleins*, the French *Petits*, and the Spanish *Chicos*.

Loag, *Logue*, and *Loague* are but three forms of and for one name, the derivation of which (without a knowledge of the family history) is not certain to our mind; but we hold that, short as the word is, it is more than probable that false spelling is the cause why its origin is not at once evident to him who knows the language and country where it first arose.

Loller, *Lollar*, *Laveler*, *Lavelor*, *Lalor*, etc., may have had their name from the *Lollard* heretics. One of the family makes this claim, and if he has the facts to back him, it must, of course, be

admitted. Certain it is that the name has as little to do with the *law* as had *Lawless*, whose original name was *Lovelace*, and who has not improved his name by the transit either in sense or sound.

If *Lummis*, *Loomis*, and *Lomax* be not Saxon and derived from the *loma* (loom), they are at all events one name in origin and should present but one appearance; nor can any effective grounds be advanced why *Loudon* should figure as *Louden*, *Lozeden*, *Ludden*, *Luddon*, unless, indeed, it be laid down as a principle, in reference to proper names, that the limit of possible involution of their compound letters is the term of their admissible changes.

Lynch is the most common orthography of a name which elsewhere appears as *Linsh*, *Linch*, *Lynsh*, and most fantastically and viciously false of all as *Lynshc*. It is a very common mistake to suppose this a Celtic name, whereas it is of Saxon lineage, and abounds in the south-west of England. It is the Anglo-Saxon *hlinc* (agger limitaneus), the ridge left unploughed to denote the boundary between fields.

Everybody who has paid any attention to the subject knows that the Irish Celts used the prefix *O* (in very old books *Ua*, and in the most ancient MSS. *Hy*), meaning *sprung of*, *descended from*, to indicate *race*, *stock*, or *sept*, and *Mac* (son) to express immediate origin. Hence the name to which *O* is prefixed merely shows the *sept*, while that which follows *Mac* expresses the proximate paternity. Thus *O'Brian* is a descendant of *Brian*, whilst *MacSorley* and *MacShan*, *Shane*, or *Shawn* are sons of *Charles* and *John* respectively.

The Highlanders of Scotland, on the other hand, never used the *O*, confining themselves to the *Mac* in the formation of their names. No claim to literary culture, at least none that will bear even a cursory examination, is set up on behalf of the Highland Gael; and whatever may be the truth of like pretensions made on behalf of ancient Erin, it is at any rate clear that said culture never extended itself at any time into the domain of Erse orthography; for, loose, dubious, and dislocated as was confessedly the spelling of the Anglo-Saxon, that of the Irish MSS. and books, both ancient and modern, even of their grammars and dictionaries, seems to be incomparably worse, and to proceed on no fixed principles whatever. The Gaels of Scotland point to no MSS.; the list of their books is even at this day exceedingly brief, and all or nearly all of what they have are in the usual Latin characters. When it is considered that every space of land amounting in size to one of our counties, had in the old days its separate jargon, hardly intelligible beyond its own bounds, that travel was very rare, and that to this day every man who speaks either Erse or Gaelic is quite sure that the sounds and words he has been accustomed to

hear and use are the only correct ones—we need not wonder that every new attempt at a grammar, a catechism, a dictionary, or a volume of sermons, only serves to multiply anomalies and to render confusion worse confounded. In their language at large, they had long since done what we are rapidly doing for the proper names of our own tongue. Most of them have already lost their native language. Strangers know more about the remains of their formerly noble language than they do, and, like helots, they do not care to learn. Neither the *O*, the *Mac*, nor the names which follow either, convey any longer to their minds the idea originally expressed thereby; for though all names in all languages were originally significant, their nomenclature has been ignorantly perverted. As a result they have committed frightful havoc upon Celtic names, to such extent that even he who possesses a meagre knowledge of the original is deeply and irrecoverably pained. To go through with any considerable number of such names would be over tedious, more especially if this were done with a mention of their derivations; but a tolerably general idea of the nature of the corruptions referred to may be obtained by observing such forms as

<i>McAlaster,</i>	<i>McAuley,</i>	<i>McLane,</i>	<i>McRea,</i>	<i>McAffay,</i>
<i>McAllister,</i>	<i>McCauley,</i>	<i>McLean,</i>	<i>McRay,</i>	<i>McAfee,</i>
<i>McCollister,</i>	<i>McColley,</i>	<i>McLain,</i>	<i>McCrea,</i>	<i>McAfoy,</i>
<i>McColister,</i>	<i>McCaullay,</i>	<i>McClane,</i>	<i>McCray,</i>	<i>McEvoy,</i>
<i>McAlster,</i>	<i>McCully,</i>	<i>McClain,</i>	<i>McRae,</i>	
<i>McHugh,</i>	<i>McAleer,</i>	<i>McKay,</i>	<i>McDavid,</i>	<i>McAffrey,</i>
<i>McCue,</i>	<i>McAlear,</i>	<i>McKoy,</i>	<i>McDevit,</i>	<i>McCaffrey,</i>
<i>McKew,</i>	<i>McLear,</i>	<i>McCoy,</i>	<i>McDavitt,</i>	<i>McCafferty,</i>
<i>McKue,</i>	<i>McLere,</i>	<i>McKee,</i>	<i>McDade,</i>	<i>McAfferty,</i>
<i>McKewe,</i>	<i>McLare,</i>	<i>McGee,</i>	<i>McDowd,</i>	<i>McGaffrey,</i>
				<i>McKeefrey.</i>

Of course there is no more objection to writing *Mac* under the form *Mc* than there is to our putting *Mr.* or *Mrs.* for the words *Master* and *Mistress*; the objections hold only as to the corruptions of the subsequent names, which in nearly all the above instances have been originally changed, either from want of thought, lack of knowledge of the actual meaning of the words, or pure illiteracy. I suppose you can hardly find one *McDonough* in a thousand who knows that his name means "*the son of Dominic*," and even an Irish scholar, unless well read in the older books, may very readily pass over the changes in pronunciation undergone by the *m* and similar letters when aspirated in euphony. If you admit the right of translation into another and a different language, very well; but that certainly would be preferable to picking it away consonant by

consonant, and vowel by vowel. On linguistic principles there is no reason why he who was *Matlack* yesterday, and to-day is *Matlett* without cavil, might not as well have called himself, so far as the matter of principle goes, either *Alexander Magnus* or *Ulysses Primus*. There exists a very extensive family whose Celtic name signifies "*son of Owen*," *Owenson* (*Owen* being a Celtic substitute for the Latin *Eugenius*). A very reputable and even a well-sounding name it is in its proper form; but they are not content to accept it thus, and the progeny of the Celtic *Eugene* call themselves by these various denominations, viz.:

<i>McOwen,</i>	<i>McKeon,</i>	<i>McKeen,</i>	<i>McCann,</i>
<i>McOwan,</i>	<i>McKeown,</i>	<i>McKenna,</i>	<i>McCaun,</i>
<i>McGowan,</i>	<i>McKeowen,</i>	<i>McKennie,</i>	<i>McGone,</i>
<i>McGowen,</i>	<i>McKayne,</i>	<i>McKinney,</i>	<i>McGoon,</i>
<i>McOin,</i>	<i>McCayne,</i>	<i>McKenney,</i>	<i>McCunne,</i>
<i>McCoyne,</i>	<i>McCane,</i>	<i>McCuney,</i>	<i>McGunn,</i>
<i>McKoyne,</i>	<i>McKane,</i>	<i>McCune,</i>	<i>McCowne,</i>
<i>McKone,</i>	<i>McKean,</i>	<i>McEwen,</i>	<i>McKeowan.</i>

Add to all this that wherever the second portion of the name begins with a consonant, it is always possible to write *Ma* instead of *Mc* or *Mac*; and where said consonant is a *C*, to transmute it into *G* or *K*; so that we have at once nearly seventy diverse modes of spelling one and the same name. The actual fact in the premises being the most conclusive *reductio ad absurdum* argument as regards the whole system, we know not why some genius of the sept, more *outré* or more perversely ingenious than the rest, should not spell it *MaghKeoghan*.

While it may be even desirable to make such a distinction in one name, *e.g.* *MacLoughlin* and *McLachlan*, as shall indicate to us whether we get them through the Erse or Gaelic, we enter into indignant protest against all such abortions as *Maglaughlan*, *Maglaughlin*, *Maglocklin*, and *MacLauckland*. Personally, we never knew but one man who spelled his name *Maglensey*, but the wrath of that one was fearful when a poor fellow addressed him on a postal under the name *McGlinchey*, which in point of fact was much nearer his true name than his own spelling of it. The original name is *MacLynch*, but they swarm in Directories under the form of *Maglensey*, *Maglinsey*, *McClinchey*, *Maclinshie*, *Maglinshie*, or *Maglenchie*.

Of *McKeever* and *McIvor* one may take his choice, there being, so far as we know, nothing imperative in the matter further than that the selection once made should be a finality.

Mcagher, *Meaher*, *Mahar*, *Maher*, *Mayher*, *Mair*, *Mear*, *Marr*,

Mar, *Maris*, *Mears*, present on separate view a formidable array of names, until a little close examination enables us to discern that they are all but one cognomen corresponding in sense to our *Field*, *Fields*, *Fielder*, *Fielding*, etc. We know, and we are glad to meet, honest *Mulligan*, who wears his true name. But we have much less use for his kinsmen *Miliigan*, *Millikin*, *Mulcahan*, *Mulcane*, *Mulgan*, *Mullan* or *Mullen*, *Mullin*, *Mullon*, etc. *Malone* needs no change into *Malony* or *Mullooney*. *Manlove* is doubtless devoted to philanthropy, but he has relatives who take their delight in phonetics, and exemplify their principles by writing their name *Manluff*. We know of the *Marischal* College, Aberdeen, and of the very pretentious *Maréchaux* of France. The vast majority of our people, however, of that name, call themselves *Marshall*. Here and there you find one who inscribes on his sign, *Marshel*, *Mershell*, or even *Morshell*. While the *Massues* (battle-axes) of the Middle Ages are content with two forms, becoming either *Massey* or *Massie*, it is far from being so with the next family, who must have split up dreadfully on domestic questions before striking out all the forms that follow, viz.: *Mayar*, *Mayer*, *Maier*, *Maiar*, *Meier*, *Meiar*, *Myer*, *Myar*, *Moyer*, *Moir*, and *da capo* suffixing an *s*. An instance in which it would be difficult to suppose anything but ignorance the cause of change is found in the name *Meacham* (*mycg-ham* = *Midgcham*), which appears as *Meachim*, *Meachum*, *Meccham*, *Mecchim*, and *Mecchum*. Now, we contend that if we are right in changing the common Saxon "*mycg*" into the English "*midge*," the same translation should take place in every name, whether of place or person, of which "*mycg*" forms a part.

Menturn, *Mentwen*, *Menton*, *Minton*, *Mendon*, *Mendan*, and *Mindon* should have one form, being in effect but one name.

The Latin "*Magnus*" is in Anglo-Saxon *Micel*, and the best Anglo-Saxon scholars have proved beyond dispute that the *c* was in some ages and places pronounced like *k*, in others like our English *ch* in "*check*." As a result we have now among us, as names, these various forms of the Saxon adjective meaning "*great*," to wit: *Mitchell*, *Mitchel*, *Michel*, *Mickle*, and *Muckle*.

In *Monro*, *Munroe*, *Monrow*, and *Monroe* only one can be the correct surname. Why retain *Maurice*, *Morrice*, and *Morris*? One of them is quite sufficient. We have no perfect synonyms in the rest of the language, why should we foster and cultivate them among our surnames? It would be a pleasure to see *Moor*, *Moore*, *More*, and *Muir* always spelled according to the first of these forms, since no one would venture to deny that to be the word which in all the languages of *Gothic descent* signifies the waste land which we English write as "*moor*;" in Celtic *Mor*, without addition.

Most of us would prefer *Murphy* to *Murfey* or *Murfy*, not cer-

tainly because of its greater faithfulness to its derivation, since *Murphy* has not the strong claim redolent of the soil which *Murphy* has, but simply numbers carry the day for the *ph*, a form not found in the Celtic at all. However, any one of the three forms is quite endurable compared with *Morphey*, who is a sham, and should be repressed at all hazard. Though *Nailer* be the name, yet for three who are contented with that spelling, fourteen write themselves *Naylor*.

Neel, *Necley*, *Neal*, *Ncale*, *Ncaley*, *Neill*, *Niel*, and *Niall*, etc., are but unnatural and difficult presentations referring to "*Nial of the nine hostages*;" nor can it be said that they are improvements upon the name given in the legend. *Nickson*, *Nigson* and *Nixon* are but another phase of what we have already seen in the case of *Dickson* and *Dixon*, or we might have noticed, had the same presented itself in *Megson*, *Migson*, *Mickson* and *Mixon*. *Nickels*, *Nichols*, *Nickols*, *Nicklas*, *Nicklos* would certainly look better by far as *Nicholas*, with the superadded advantage of being correct, while two or three of them are manifestly mere corruptions, some of them abbreviations.

Ogden is the current English pronunciation of the name which is written indiscriminately *Hodgden* and *Hugden*; but we do not stand heavily in need of more than one form for *O'Donnel*, *O'Donel*, *O'Donald* and even *O'Daniel*. What do you want with *O'Mealey*, *O'Mailey*, *O'Meala* and *O'Malley*? The *O'Dwyers* are overdoing it when they give us also *O'Dwyre*, *O'Dwire*, *O'Dire*, *O'Dyre*, *O'Dyer*, etc. The German names *Ahn* (ancestor) and *Anne* are most barbarously presented to us under the forms of *Onn* and *Onny*; while *Ovey* and *Oynes* are clearly *Hovey* and *Hoynes* shorn of the *H* to which their derivation entitles them; and they in turn are corruptions of *Haughey* (also written *Huffey*) and *Hynes* or *Hines*.

Like many another person who gets his name from a trade, *Painter* does not like to be reminded of his ancestor's daily work, and therefore he figures (to the eye at least) as *Paynter* or *Payntor*. In Boswell's "*Life of Johnson*" we have some account of a Mr. *Paradise*, who figures here under a painfully Anglicised form of the French name, thus: *Paradee*. But this has nothing whatever to do with the names *Pardce*, *Purdce*, *Pardy* and *Purdy*, which were at first doubtlessly applied to individuals noted for profanity, just as the French are known to have attributed to the English as a generic name the *oath* so commonly heard from the lips of *Albion's sons*.

The *Palmers* were pilgrims of old, whether to Rome or to the Holy Land, and the derivation of the name is quite evident. *Farmer* and *Parmar* are ignorant pronunciations of the same, ex-

emplified by yet more abominable spelling; but *Permer*, amid his ignorance, which is patent, is additionally afflicted (though he is unaware of it) with affectation and finicality.

We must lump as one *Paton*, *Patton*, *Peyton*, *Payton* and *Peaton*; neither is there any difference beyond false lettering between the name of the poet *Parnell* and of the multitudinous *Purnells* of the Directory. *Perse* and *Percé* are the oldest forms of the surname which is nowadays correctly written as *Percy*; but *Pearce*, *Pierce*, *Pearse*, etc., are corruptions of the old English name *Piers*, which in turn was the English mode of writing the Norman *Pierre* as a patronymic, and meant no more with its added *s* than *Peterson*. The letters are retained in *Pierson*, and the sound in *Pearson*.

The good name *Percival* has degenerated without any shadow of reason into *Pursel*, *Pursell*, *Fursol*, *Pursoll*, *Purcel*, *Purcell*, *Pearsol*, *Piersoll* and *Persal*.

Pennecwell is found in the "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle;" we have still *Pennitwell* from a false notion of its derivation, and without any reference to etymology there stand for it in our Dictionary, or Directory rather, *Pennel*, *Pannel*, *Pannil*, *Fennell*, *Pannell*, *Pentwell* and *Pantwel*. We cannot discover with any certainty whether the common noun or the name of the Scottish town be the original of the closely allied forms *Peoples* and *Peebles*; but if called upon for a casting vote, we would give our suffrage for the proper name, which at any rate has possession in its favor, and should not lightly be disturbed.

The *Fallons* who call themselves *Phalon*, *Phalen*, *Phelan*, etc., deserve to be lashed; and this the more so as the origin and significance of the term are not in the least indistinct, *Shan O'Fallion* being simply *Johannes di Pallio* or *Palliatus*, both Christian and surname coming from the Latin soon after the introduction of Christianity into Ireland.

Philip we know very well as a first name, but we also know its derivation, and this "horse-fancier" has neither rhyme nor reason in taking a second *l*. Yet we currently find *Phillips*, still worse *Phelps*. There was even a *Phipps* in the last century, and the Norman diminutive *Phillipot* has given us *Philpot*, which would doubtless have been written *Fullpot*, but that people, however ignorant, are unwilling wittingly to vulgarize their names.

Whether, as in German, his Polish origin gave *Polack* his name, changed afterwards by him and his into *Pollock*, or however else the surname may have been acquired, it is assuredly not *Polk* in spelling, still less *Poke* in pronunciation.

Price, *Preese*, *Preece*, *Pritchett* and *Prodger*, or *Prodgers*, were in days gone by *ap Rhys*, *ap Richard*, and *ap Roger*. It is not, however, within our scope to give the derivations, but rather to indi-

cate the variations in the individual names adduced, and we only touch the etymology when it throws light upon the correct spelling or sound of the word. Such names as *Palfrey*, *Poindexter*, *Palmatary*, etc., of which (to the credit of the bearers) we find but one spelling, however interesting in their etymology, would lead us too far, did we attempt to pursue that branch of the subject.

When *Quinn* is changed into *Queen*, we all know the reason to be that the individual *Quinn* is in that case foolishly ashamed of his country and likely enough of his ancestors and their religion; and the *Coyle*, or rather *Cahill* before us, has taken a very devious mode of hiding his name by writing it *Quyle*! Defaced beyond recognition are the pretended names *Querey* and *Quirey*; and the forms presented are so manifestly the result of a game of pitch and toss with whatever letters may have originally composed the words, that it is hardly worth while to speculate as to whether the name was *Quarry* (*Quarrière*), *Quarré* (*hodiè Carré*, square) or anything else.

In *Redcliff*, *Radcliff*, *Ratcliff*, *Ratliff* and *Rawliff* (to all these and similar ones an *e* may be added!), the first form gives the original derivation, and the others are but degenerate representatives of the antetype. We know personally that people of that name in the lower (meaning thereby the more uneducated) walks of life are usually called and sometimes spell themselves as *Ratley*, *Radley*, *Ratleigh* and *Rutley*; nor are we at all sure but *Raligh*, *Rowley* and *Rawley* are essentially the same surname. In short, there is good reason to believe that *Sir Walter Raligh*,—the *Rowley* of Chatterton,—*Sir Stratford de Redcliffe* and *Harry Ratley* (the *quondam* keeper of a famous kennel for fancy dogs) are all relatives, and of kin much closer than that by which we all count from *Noah*, claiming always by the male descent, and deriving the variation in social standing from the greater or less amount of money and consequent influence they were able to secure.

Raynolds, *Reynolds* and *Ranolds*, *Raynells*, *Reynells* and *Rannells*, *Runnels*, *Runnells*, *Rennells*, *Rennolls*, etc., are but various uncalled for modifications of *Ranald*, or *Ronald*, with the patronymic sign of the genitive attached; and though he be hard to run to earth, it is but the old fox *Reynard* that we pursue under the various disguises of *Rannard*, *Raynard*, *Rainer*, *Rennerd*, *Rennert*, *Rennard* and *Raynert*.

From the English city, Saxon both in name and origin, we have *Reading*, *Redding*, *Reddon*, *Redden*, *Ruddon*, *Ruddin* and *Rudding*.

Reece, *Rice* and *Reese* represent to us the Cymric *Rhys*. Who will tell us that there is any reason for making of one significant word so many forms as *Red*, *Rcdd*, *Reddy*, *Reddie*, *Read*, *Reade*, *Reed*, *Reid*, *Reidd* and *Ried*?

In Saxon times a *reeve* was a constable, and the name often clung to his offspring as a surname; hence the *Reeves*. But how wonderfully the difference of even a single letter helps us out of a strait. *Reeve* or *Reeves* was vulgar. *Rives* is highly aristocratic. After this change we are no longer of the *Saxon churls*, but of the *Normans*,—we were not conquered, but belong to the conquerors, —we are no longer sprung from a policeman, but we are *des Rives*, “of the banks,” forsooth!

An ancestor of the *Rhodes* of this Directory may have fought there, as is claimed by one of the English family writing their name in this manner, but there is at least among moderns rather scant authority for names derived from successful military engagements; so, whether the name be spelled *Rhodes*, *Rhoads*, *Rhoades*, or simply *Roads*, we shall insist, till proof to the contrary is adduced, on believing that the surname in this instance springs from some ancestor who had his name from his “*canteen*” kept at the “*X roads*.”

The anecdote is told of a “*longshoreman*” attentively observing the progress of the work while a painter lettered on the stern of a boat the word *Psyche*, which being at length finished, he drew a long breath, and observed: “Well, if that ain’t the *dernedest* way to spell “*Fish!*” We felt very much inclined to supplement the remark by something yet stronger, when we came across one *Ryan* in our Directory who spelled himself *Rhyen!*”

What more blatant falsehood can there be than when men named *Rich* spell themselves *Riche*, *Ryche*, *Richie*, *Richy* and *Ritchie*? Yet they are all here, five deep, in one book, and probably each one of us knows several of them. Why not agglomerate *Roden*, *Rodden*, *Ratwdon*, *Raudon*; make one name of *Rooney* and *Roney*; and for the different and useless forms *Rosell*, *Rosselle*, *Roszell*, *Roszelle* and *Rossel*, set down the one name *Russell*?

As is almost universally the case with the terms indicating the various handicrafts, to increase or diminish the name, the *Saddlers* drop a *d* when they do not go further and make a nondescript of their name by writing it *Sadlier*. There is no such word; there ought to be no such name, and it belongs, in its present form, to no language.

No better guide is wanted, even for positive ignorance, in spelling the name *Salisbury* than the well-known name of the city so called. Yet the fact is that we meet it as a surname almost under every form rather than this, the correct one, and *Saulsbury*, *Salusbury*, *Salisbury* and *Solsbury* pain the eye of the reader and shock the sensibilities of the scholar at every turn.

Sanders, instead of having anything to do with *sand*, is in some instances a base corruption of *St. Andrews* and in others a patro-

nymic derived from *Sander*, a nickname for *Alexander*. *Sinclair* and *Sinkler* stand for *St. Clare*, as *Sample* and *Semple* do for *St. Paul* or *St. Pol*.

The name of an English "bruiser" who fought years ago with an American "rough" was spelled *Sayers*, and we have the name still, together with the variations *Sayres*, *Sairs*, *Sears* and *Sires*, all amounting, however, but to one name.

Saylor is quite as anxious as *Taylor* and *Payntor* to avoid his true name, which must have been *Sailer*; true, he might have been of Teutonic origin, and in that case he is a *funambulus*—a rope-dancer by origin.

Scanlan may possibly be excused when he spells himself *Scanlon*, but we are not so ready to extend him a fool's pardon when he calls himself *Scantlan*; still less when he develops into *Scantland*.

Schoenfeld is our *Fairfield*, the Gallic *Beauchamp*, the Spanish and Italian *Campo bello*, the Scottish *Campbell*; yet it appears in the book before us as *Shoonfield*, *Shoonfelt*, *Shumfield*, *Shumfelt*, *Shamfeldt* and even *Shufelt*.

One would think at first sight there would be no possibility of manipulating *Sharp*, but yet it has been elongated by an *e* paragogic (as grammarians say) and strengthened by the epenthesis of an *i*—*Shairpe*.

We have an account of the "One-hoss Shay," it is true, but why should any *Shea* who knows anything of the tongue of his ancestors call himself *Shay*?

The descendants of the *Shepherds* have done almost all that can be done with letters to avoid the correct form. Hence we have here *Shephard*, *Sheppart*, *Shepart*, *Sheppert*, *Sheppard* and *Shepperd*.

Short was hard enough put to it when he played out his only trump as *Shortt*.

Mr. Siderwell reappears, though one might hardly fancy them of the same family under the names of *Siddel*, *Sidel*, *Sidell*, *Seedle* and *Seidle*.

From extraneous sources we discover that a whole clan of people called *Sinex* in this Directory are descended from a Swedish family who formerly wrote themselves, or rather were written, as *Seneca*, a fact of which nothing but actual proof could have convinced us, since in language (pretence apart) a harsh termination never takes the place of a smoother.

Slicbhin means in Celtic "monticulus," but they generally write themselves *Slevin* or *Slavin*. Isolated instances of *Slevin* and *Slayven* appear, but when the disease has progressed to that extent they are apt to become *Mountain* or *Montaigne*, of which real instances are known.

Solway, like the *Conway* of whom we spoke in a former article, expresses his own drawling pronunciation when he writes himself *Solloway*.

Speakman is intelligible, while *Spickman* is not.

What games are played with the name of *St. Stephen*! Who can say, unless he simply sets himself ingeniously to work in order to imagine all the different mutations possible upon these two syllables? Confining ourselves to those set down in the Directory of a small city, we find *Stephans*, *Stephens*, *Stevans*, *Stevens*, *Steephans* and *Steephens*.

The *Steward* rarely appears as a proper name in that form, since that would indicate an avocation in life below the dignity of those who are as anxious to indicate by their names that they and their ancestors had nothing to do as ever was Chinaman by the length of his nails. He becomes, consequently, *Stewart*, *Stuart*, *Stuard* and even *Stoord*.

Let us find, in passing, no fault with *Strahan* when he calls himself *Strane* and *Strain*, reserving our objurgations for him when he undertakes to write *Strahane*, and more especially when he puts the accent on the second syllable, *Stra-hane'*.

Fully convinced are we that there never was either Celt, Saxon or Gaul by the name *Schwab*. A *Teuton* he was and a *Teuton* he remains, even when he calls himself *Schwope*, *Swope*, or still more horribly, *Swabb*; yet Schiller says of his countrymen:

“ Auch manchen Mann, auch manchen Held,
Gebär das *Schwabenland*.”

Sweeny has possession—nine points of law—and however we may put up with *Sweeney*, we are not so ready to admit *Swinny* or *Swinney* to a place at the board. It is a black shame that people, many of them having, to judge by their positions in society, at least some knowledge of literature or a chance of acquaintance with their own ancient and highly useful language, and some common sense, should nevertheless play such fantastic tricks with their names.

We find *Tally*, *Tolly* and *Tully* (even though an *e* be inserted before the *y*) one and the same name; indeed, in this instance they are all blood relations who bear them.

The Saxon *Thorpe* or *Thorp*, equivalent to the German *Dorf* and more Northern and Western *Doorp*, is presented as *Tharp*, *Tharpe*, *Thrap*, *Throp*, *Throop*, and even *Troop*.

Tillman, who, as his name fully indicates, was a mere *colonus* or *rusticus*, is dignified, when his descendants have gained a very different footing, into *Tilghman*, which means just nothing; but the crowd does not know that; silent letters look solemn, and “*omne*

ignotum est magnificum" is true of many things not desiring to be ranked with the vulgar herd.

Can you find a man anywhere who has paid attention enough to Anglo-Saxon to understand clearly that easiest of all non-vernacular reading, the Gospels, who supposes *Tildon*, *Tilden*, *Tilton*, *Tillton*, etc., to be more than a single name? The name of the well-known translator appears in books as *Tindale*, *Tindall*, *Tyndal*, *Tynndale*, *Tynedale*, and we recall seeing it somewhere in the West as *Tindle*. What a number of *O'Tooles* have we not who choose to register themselves as *Towle*, *Toale*, and even *Tole*. *Trexler*, *Drexler* and *Trixler* are the devices to which people of Germanic origin whose ancestors were workers at the *lath*, have recourse to disguise the ignobility of their family name, *Drechsler*.

Thackara, *Thackera*, *Thackwray* and *Thackeray* are all ways of false presentation of the name of the great novelist, a name which, after all, is in origin but the *Docce-wrath* of a former article.

Uber, *Huber*, *Hoover*, *Hoover* and *Hewber* need no argument to show either their relationship or their Teutonic origin; and when an *Onderdonk* signs himself *Undertunk*, or an *Opdik* presents himself as *Updyke*, the chances are that he knows, in either case, so little of derivation that talk to him would indeed be but "*vox clamantis in deserto*."

Wallace, *Wallis*, *Wallis*, *Walls*, *Walsh*, *Walch*, *Welch*, *Welsh*, *Welles* and *Wells* mean, and are no more and no less than what the Germans express by *Wälsh*, French *Étranger*, and English *Stranger*. It is singular that the name of the sept in Irish is *Brennecagh* and is translated *Welsh*. Just as *Enraughty* is in a city of Virginia pronounced "*Darby*" by way of change.

Mr. *Weir* may write himself *Wier*, *Weier*, *Weyer*, *Ware*, *Wayre* or *Wayer*, and may, to the extent of his ability, confuse the inquirer after names; but the surname remains what it was, the cuttle-fish tactics failing to becloud permanently its original form.

Wellesley and *Wesley* are conclusively proved to have been one before the aggrandizement of the first and the labefaction of the second, the original name being *West-lea*. Even the name of our own *Washington* might with very great propriety have been left in its older form of *Wessington*.

Whelan, *Whalen*, *Wayland*, *Welland*, etc., should all be written as the form first given.

We find here a *Weitzel*, which is the correct name, and afterwards these different variations from it: *Wetsel*, *Witsel*, *Wittsell*, *Witsell*, *Witsill*, *Wetsel* and *Whitsil*. On inquiry we find the whole family to be not yet a generation from the *Vaterland*.

Willie, *Willey*, *Willy*, *Wiley*, with the playful variations of *Willie* and *Willey*, need neither explanation nor proof of unity. *Wise* once

in a while indulges in writing himself *Wyse*; and the Anglo-Saxon "*wiht*," which would naturally give us "*wight*," actually furnishes us the more pretentious but less intelligible *Wyatt*.

We have no special fault to find with *Yates* and *Yateman*, so long as they abstain from writing themselves *Yeates* and *Yeatman*, for there can be no doubt that the Saxons, whilst spelling with a *g*, yet pronounced with a *y*. However, as the common noun is now indisputably "gate," there would seem to be no valid reason why all proper names of which this word forms a part should not be similarly spelled. At any rate, some uniformity in practice is highly desirable.

We have thus from two separate but small Directories taken some of the more salient instances in which illiteracy, a desire for singularity, want of thought or mere caprice has caused either a single change or even many mutations in what ought to be one and the same name. It is not, however, contended that those now bearing these names are of necessity accessory to the change under which the individual name suffers. Many—nay, probably, most of them—occupy the position of *bonâ fide* holders, and are not at all in fault for the mutations previously occurring in a surname which they inherited after its mutilation or possible exaggeration.

Horne Tooke's simile, in which he compares the dropping off of letters to the straggling of soldiers on a long march, holds very well of the common words of a language; for these words, not being exclusively appropriated to the individual, do not come within the domain of personal vanity, the tendency of which latter is, in nearly every instance, to enlargement by the addition of letters. Instances quite sufficient of mutations arising from all the enumerated causes have been furnished in this and a previous article, and we contend for nothing more than this, viz.: that our language, of which our surnames certainly form a part, has reached such a point of literary advancement that our names should, for the future at least, not be left a prey to the caprice of conceit, the inertia of ignorance, or the quirks of the etymological quibbler. Instances have been given in which we have anywhere from *five* up to *seventy* different modes of spelling a name originally one and the same. It needs no learning to discover the general facts, though a little acquaintance with the Anglo-Saxon is a great advantage in the investigating of many of the more recondite cases, but for practical purposes, the man who can read needs only to take a walk in any of our large cities, examining the sign-boards, to discover that the plan of procedure in the matter of our names has no claim to be considered a *method*, much less a *system*, and that if it be a part of our language (as will hardly be denied) that language itself must be rapidly going to the bad. It was long

believed in a vague, undefined, general sort of a way, that, while the law had at least so much to do with our proper names and surnames that an Act of Parliament in England, or of one of our Legislatures in the United States, was necessary before a valid change of either could take place, we were free from the shackles of statutes in all the rest of our spelling, and it is a curious comment on the efficacy of law, as applied to matters with which the law has, as such, no proper concern, that under this regime and supposition of the general community, the only portion of our orthography which can be said to have taken fixed form is exactly that with which the law was believed to have nothing to do; and the spelling of our names, long supposed to be specially within the scope of legislation by statute, is exactly that portion of our language which remains most loose and undecided.

Of course no sensible writer expects by an article or two to make headway at once against the sluggish apathy of the public, even of the literary public, as to the establishment of a central authority for the orthography of names. If in all this length of time it has been heretofore found impracticable to found an *Academy* of the English language, it is manifestly still more so to bring people, "*lege solutas*," to submit to any dictation as regards their names. But they can at any rate be shown the absurdity or oddities of many of their vagaries in nomenclature, and be made to understand that they do not succeed in palming off the imposture on all the world, that they are seen through and quietly laughed at in the process when they themselves are the originators of the mutation; and where such change has been inflicted on them by or through ancestors or others, we wish them what we cannot supply, viz.: the sense to spell their names aright. This is as applicable to ourselves as to any one else. We well know that we cannot fail but offend some of those bearing now and then a name mentioned, as illustrative of the position assumed in regard to surnames in general; but it will be at once seen that there has at the same time been no intentional offence, since the names occurring have not been specially sought out, and are simply those which were stumbled upon in following out the lists given; nor have we used even the half of those which we might have adduced. And here, in conclusion, we may be allowed to remark that, in our opinion, a book both useful and instructive might be made on this subject, but that for the thorough compilation thereof both leisure, access to authorities, and a comprehensive knowledge of languages will be required, all three of which rarely fall to the lot of the same individual, and that without them the aforesaid book were better unattempted.

BOLLAND AND THE FIRST BOLLANDISTS.

IN a recent sermon the learned Bishop of Richmond stated that in the lives of the Saints "truth is often stranger than fiction." Yet, how very few, even of those interested in literary and historical research, whilst seeking for information, think of turning to the old tomes in which are recorded the majestic deeds of the Servants of God. Facts more astounding than the greatest victories of armies, or the grandest triumphs of monarchs, lie hidden in that dim obscurity which surrounds the lives of most of the Saints. The records of the heroic deeds of the children of the Church are chiefly unwritten, or if written, are carelessly thrown aside unread by the many, whilst the actions of worldly men, even though tainted with selfishness and the other failings of humanity, are lauded by a thousand pens, and studied by the multitude. Powerful historical novels have been written, and their success has been attested by the multitude of readers who have been attracted by the magnetism of the tales; who have shed tears of sympathy over the fate of the heroes and heroines, and who have followed the writers' plots with interest so intense that at times it amounts almost to enthusiasm. Yet, matter much more interesting, and certainly far more instructive, lies hidden in the histories of God's servants. However, notwithstanding this fact, the lives of the Saints are not read. Why is this the case? In the lives of many of them can be found ample material, which, if properly developed, would form the bases of most healthy and interesting novels. Moreover, in these the authors would not be compelled to draw upon their wits' ends for imaginary facts. They need but simply retail in story language the events which signalized the lives and times of these holy persons. Cardinal Wiseman in "*Fabiola*," Cardinal Newman in "*Callista*," Father Bresciani in several of his works, and others, have led the way in this matter, have shown its possibility, and have proved that it can be successful. Some of our most beautiful novels, which are Christian in character and plot, have been written from material found in the lives of the Saints. There is a poetry in these lives which, when properly placed before us, exceeds by far the thrilling beauty of the magic tales which entranced our youth, or of that fairy lore which, whilst instructing and refining us, afforded the gentlest of recreation for the mind.

It is a truth which cannot be gainsaid that, comparatively speaking, Catholics know but little concerning Catholic Saints;

and it is likewise true that the bulk of our people are unwilling to bother themselves with books of piety about the Saints. Why must these books be considered as desirable for, and of service to, those alone who seek that perfection of spirit which is obtained only by renouncing all things for Jesus? Perhaps it may be because our English writers have contented themselves with a dull, prosy style, in which they barely narrate facts, condensing as much matter into a few pages as possible. Butler is condemned by many for this reason. It does seem as if we had no real histories of the Saints in English. Some lives of special Saints are now being published, it is true, which reflect great credit on the compilers, such as those of St. Francis Xavier, St. Catharine of Siena, St. Charles Borromeo, and others. But the collective lives of God's servants which we possess in English are compiled more after the manner of cyclopedias or books of reference than of books which are intended for every-day perusal. Thus, of the English edition which is best known and most commonly used, a celebrated writer says: "Butler is a warped mirror, which is far from reflecting the Saints in that radiant beauty in which they have shone in their day. If he does not cast them down from the thrones on which the pious of various ages have been accustomed to view them, he rarely leaves untouched the aureolas with which God has crowned them. If he relates with what courage they despoiled themselves of the goods of this world, he is likewise careful not to portray the splendors with which God has crowned them. Doubtless he feared lest he might dazzle or scandalize those eyes which the arid and bare atmosphere of Protestantism had rendered unaccustomed to these glimpses of divine light, to these sweet and rich reflections of heaven."

Many of the most beautiful and instructive events in the careers of different Saints have been either entirely omitted or lightly dealt with by Butler. Well authenticated miracles, positive attacks of the demons, even most edifying conversations with the Saviour, have, if noticed at all, been summed up in a few bare words. Probably this was done through the same motive which afterwards led to the discontinuance of the "*Oratorian Lives*," the fear lest those of other beliefs might be shocked or scandalized. But "why attempt to be wiser than the Church, which is guided by the spirit of God? She does not blush at that marvellous in the lives of the Saints which raises them so poetically above the monotonies of human life. She is not ashamed of that wonderful way in which God manifests himself when man is willing to forget himself; in which is restored to man a portion of that empire over nature which was broken by his first fall."

M. Paul Guerin, in his introduction to the "*Petits Bollandistes*,"

finds fault with Butler for his nationalism. He says that Butler is too English, that he devotes his pages chiefly to English-speaking saints, and gives but little space to many servants of God who were born of French parents, or who lived on French soil. We must consider this criticism as rather unjust, inasmuch as Butler's "Lives" were intended for English readers. M. Guerin himself becomes much more forcibly open to a like objection. Whilst giving to his book a title which indicated that it should be a condensation of that most wonderful production, the "Acta Sanctorum," he yet manages to give his collection a thoroughly French bias. Thus, if we take his sketch of St. Patrick, we find it short and incomplete. His life of St. Bridget is by no means as well narrated as the life of the same Saint by the gifted Montalembert. St. Wilfred, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Becket, all suffer at his hands from the scantiness of the matter furnished. Moreover, when we take into account the natural dispositions of the two races, and the tendencies of the two languages, we will be much more inclined to excuse Butler than M. Guerin. A Frenchman will become enthusiastic over matters, while an Englishman placed in similar circumstances will remain stolidly cool. The Englishman, by his education, looks for plain, ungarnished facts, whilst the Frenchman loves to see these same facts garlanded with all the beauties of language.

Godescard and Bailly, says the critic, are cold and uninteresting. "They leave on us the impression which we feel when promenading in a garden which has been stripped by the frost. The breath of a cold and deathly criticism has left neither leaf nor flower." Legends and traditions of doubtful authority have, by some means, crept into the annals of Surius. The inaccuracies of Ribadeneira was one of the reasons which led to the great work of the Bollandists. However, these latter works are known only to the educated, and are not within the reach of the people. What we need are good, trustworthy histories of the Saints of the Church, written in a pleasing, popular style, which will meet the needs of the many, and not be beyond their purses.

Our people do not know the lives of the Saints. Let us give an example. Three years ago the centenary of Martin Luther was celebrated in the German Empire with great *éclat*. The daily papers were filled with accounts of similar services held in the principal cities of the world. Lengthy notices of the various ceremonies attending the event were written and published. His was the embodiment of the disturbing element of revolt. Still, his memory is kept green, and his friends have been able to falsify the records of history concerning him to such an extent that deluded thousands yet look upon him as a special messenger of God, raised

for a special purpose, at a special time. Two years ago was celebrated the centenary of the noble St. Charles Borromeo. Yet was it scarcely heard of beyond the walls of the Catholic cities in which the celebration took place. A few words by cable announced the event, and then all was over. The result is that Catholics know more, and in many cases, we fear, believe more of the so-called history of Martin Luther than they do of the genuine history of one of the greatest reformers and Saints of the Church.

There is, then, a wide field which can be filled by capable writers, with much benefit to themselves and to the faithful. Marina, who was Superior of the Dominicans, said: "As there is no more profitable and efficacious instruction for salvation than the lives of the Saints, so there are few who deserve more highly of the Church triumphant and militant than they who bring from darkness the histories and deeds of the Saints, and who from the mountain height of the Church put these forward for the imitation of the faithful, as the absolute exemplars of all Christian perfection." Let the writers of these new volumes take some of the gems from what we may call the "crown diamonds" of Catholic history and biography, those grand tomes of the Bollandists. In these will be found all that can be desired as far as matter is concerned, coupled with the assurance that not one line is unauthenticated when copied from original manuscripts or received from the traditions and legends of monastic institutions. And to the whimsical we would say that legends are not to be cast aside because of prejudices, or to propitiate the favor of the various denominations. The marvellous or the miraculous is not to be declared superstitious because of the bigotry of unbelievers. Facts are to be weighed in each case, and historical evidence is to be taken for its worth in the lives of the Saints as well as in the lives of other renowned personages. Traditions are to be respected, and the truth which is in them is to be carefully sifted from the covering of tale which time may have weaved around them.

Already can we perceive among the orthodox non-Catholics a veering round to strong faith in those very traditions which but a century ago were declared superstitious by their church vestrys. The High Church party acknowledge their belief in Saints and saintly lives. Not possessing within their fold a stock from which to draw, they are fain to enter the Catholic ranks to obtain edifying matter for their children. The stories of the Saints are published by them, not, indeed, as we would wish to see them, but with sufficient bias to lead the youthful or inexperienced reader to imagine that these heroes of Catholicity had been either forerunners or active members of the Anglican schism. Nor are these writers ashamed to portray the noted miracles of the Saints. In fact,

the Ritualistic party of to-day is by far more credulous than are Catholics.

Blessed as the Anglican party is with an ample share of the goods of this world, it can easily effect the wide distribution of its books. Here is another of our difficulties, and another reason why the lives of the Saints are not read by Catholics. Books of this kind are luxuries, and the Catholics of the United States, who as a body walk the humbler paths of life, cannot afford luxuries. To bring out these books properly requires much research and much talent. Time is needed for research, and writers of ability must needs receive proper compensation. Now, these difficulties, although great, are not insurmountable. The writers of the Bollandist collection found the Catholic world willing to aid them by purse and every other possible means. So, in all probability, if the initiative be taken to-day, the courageous writers who make the start will find noble Catholics ready to back them in the enterprise. The fact that this might be the means of saving our youth from the abominable flashy literature which is now spread before them on all sides, would be incentive enough to many generous Catholics to make them patrons of the work. Certainly it is humiliating to us to know that the first extended notice in English of Bolland and his associates in the greatest literary and historical work which the Church can call her own, has been prepared by an Anglican clergyman, and given to us by a non-Catholic publishing house.

Who, then, was Bolland, and what is the collection which has been called after him? In the seventeenth century, at the famous university of Douay, a good, holy Jesuit professed philosophy. His name was Rosweyde. He had conceived the idea of compiling from the various manuscripts of which he could obtain control a series of the lives of some of the most important Saints. Amid the multiplied duties of the professorial chair and the care of the souls of the parish, he had labored earnestly in gathering from every available quarter such manuscript copies of the Acts of the Saints as would be of service to him in his contemplated work. As matter began to accumulate, the ideas of Rosweyde concerning his work began to expand. He resolved to enlarge its scope and to make it more comprehensive. But, before his thought had become a fact, the good priest died, October, 1629.

At his death Rosweyde left a large pile of valuable documents and manuscripts, which were to have been used in the compilation of his work. What was to be done with these? Were they to be cast aside to return once more to that darkness whence the energy of Rosweyde had drawn them, and, as a consequence, to be lost forever to history? Were they, after having been obtained at such

pains, to be permitted to moulder away on dusty shelves or to become the food of the destructive bookworm? Roswedye was a Jesuit. His enterprise, therefore, inasmuch as it had the approval of his superiors, was rather a community design than the work of an individual. Nor was it the intention of the Society to allow his labors to be lost. Three members of the Society were selected as being in every way fit to gather and prepare for use Rosweyde's literary wealth. Of these three John Bollandus, or Bolland, was the universal choice of the Society. He received orders to betake himself to Antwerp, that he might there familiarize himself with his new duties. His preceding years had been spent in the faithful discharge of the duties assigned to him by his superiors. But his life may be said to have been condensed into the years which he spent in Antwerp as director of the "*Acta Sanctorum*."

Bolland went to Antwerp, saw the condition of affairs, and returned to report to his superiors. He stated that there was every hope of a rich harvest if the proper men were sent to care for the seed which had been sown. As far as the publication of the labors of Rosweyde was concerned, he told his superior that he had found things even less ready for the press than he had expected. Rosweyde had told many of his friends that he would begin the publication of his work in October; but before the day set for the starting of the press had arrived Rosweyde had gone to his eternal home, and things were cast into a direful state of confusion. Bolland, however, honestly told the Provincial that if left free to follow his own ideas, and if the material gathered by Rosweyde were left at his disposal, he could bring out a book which would reflect credit on his order and be a glory to the Church. To effect this he demanded, as a matter of justice, that the many precious books which had been purchased by Rosweyde should be restored to the house. It appears that on the death of Rosweyde many of the most valuable tomes had been carted away in a spirit of vandalism to the public library. In these matters, as well as in the controversies which arose with the town authorities concerning the restoration of the stolen volumes, the Provincial coincided with and upheld Bolland. He sent him to Antwerp, and saw to it that the pilfered books were returned. Bolland was to have charge of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin and the cure of the souls of the parish. All other free time and such as he could legitimately spare from his parish work was to be devoted to his new task.

It was providential, says the historian, that neither the aged superior nor the obedient Bolland understood thoroughly the immense extent of the new undertaking. Otherwise the religious world would in all probability be still deprived of that rich mine of literary and spiritual wealth which it now possesses. The humble

Jesuit would have been appalled at the magnitude of the task placed before him, and the ever considerate superior would have hesitated before placing so heavy a burden upon his subject.

However, the work soon grew under his hands. Rosweyde had contented himself with getting what manuscripts he could from neighboring towns. Not so Bolland. His sharp eye took in all Europe. The work began to expand. His ready pen was soon busied in sending missives to all the Jesuit houses throughout the Continent, inviting aid and soliciting such manuscripts as might be of future service. As the labor incumbent on such a proceeding increased, so did his zeal and energy. Not a letter remained unanswered nor a point of information obtained unused. Whilst busied about these things, he at the same time aided others from all lands in getting out their new publications. Scholars from all parts of the globe flocked to Antwerp. It became a modern Athens, and the centre of literary homage was the humble Bolland. Poetry, philosophy and theology were all subjected to his criticism. Despite his priestly duties, which were by no means small, and his historical researches in the preparation of the "*Acta*," he still found ample time to expurgate and prepare revised editions of the classics, and by his genius to solve the many intricate and difficult questions which were brought to him as to the most learned man of the day.

We all know how many difficulties beset the initiative of a task. There are the fears lest it may not succeed, the disappointments in the very quarters from which we expected encouragement, and the countless things to which we should attend, but cannot. Bolland felt and suffered from all this. With no fully developed plan of his coming work, with interviews to give, and with numberless letters and inquiries to attend to, he made but little progress. At all events, the work was not being pushed with sufficient rapidity to satisfy the eager desire of those who had looked forward to its speedy completion. Five years had gone by, and the first volume, which had been long promised, had not as yet appeared from the press. The patrons were beginning to complain, and to show signs of discouragement. From his poorly furnished room, which was verily a literary litter, Bolland wrote to his superiors that his task was a life work. Seeing how much he was hampered by parochial duties, his superiors released him from the charge of the sodality, and from a portion of the labors of the confessional. A helper was given him in the person of F. Henschen, a zealous and talented young priest. Entering fully into the designs of Bolland, Henschen gave a new impetus to the work. It began to assume greater proportions. The broad ideas of the younger man were engrafted on the scheme of Bolland. As a consequence, the labor

of the task was increased as the design of the book was enlarged. As the developments of Bolland had been an improvement on the original plan of Rosweyde, so the broader scope of Henschen was an improvement on that of Bolland.

Bolland and Henschen worked most zealously together, the former looking upon the latter as a co-laborer, the latter ever regarding the former as his superior. They honestly determined to allow nothing to enter their volumes at which the impious might cavil, which sciolists might despise, or which the uneducated might not understand. They recognized the fact that heretics, even as in our day, regarded many of the deeds and acts of the Saints as legends and fables, and laughed at the credulity of the Catholics who placed faith in them. They were aware that so-called history teemed with calumnies against the truth of the best authenticated miracles. They, therefore, resolved that it was better that, hereafter, either nothing should be written about the lives and acts of the Saints, or that they should be so accurately and plainly set forth that no one could impugn the slightest matter; that whatever errors might have slipped in previously in the narration of these lives should be now properly corrected, and that every doubtful matter should be most closely examined. Thus "the eyes of the invidious and the mouths of the malicious would be compelled to acknowledge the majesty of Catholic truth and sanctity appearing with such *éclat* in the lives of the Saints."

To these canons which the Fathers had adopted for their guidance they adhered most closely. It is the scrupulous care with which the researches were made, the almost absolute freedom from error, and the guaranteed authenticity of each given document, which makes the Bollandist collection one of the most precious treasures of the Church, and the best record of Christian historical facts extant. Still, does it not appear more than passing strange to behold men of other faiths drawing their knowledge of the Saints from these lives, together with their ideas of the historical occurrences of the times, and yet distorting the facts obtained to suit their own fancy or end? Following no canon of history save their own whims or popular prejudice, they select what pleases them and proclaim it truth; and reject as false, because it opposes their theories, what rigid investigation wholly substantiates. Or maybe, like Sismondi and Hallam, they are willing to accept such facts as they may need from the lives of the Saints, but will credit them to other sources, lest the world might consider them as inclining toward "Romanism." Perhaps it was for the use of such garbled quotations that Cardinal Newman years ago declared Hallam a most dangerous writer; and perhaps it is for a like reason

that Mr. Lilly declares Dean Milman a brilliant but inaccurate writer.

The difficulties which beset Bolland and his companion at the very beginning of the work were sufficient to make the strongest minds hesitate before assuming such a task. As the work progressed, the difficulties became greater. Copies of manuscripts from the various libraries were to be compared with the originals. Correspondence with learned and religious men in every quarter of the continent was to be attended to. What was to be inserted and what omitted; the separation of authentic from false documents; the expunging of inaccuracies; the historical data to be given; all these things required in their preparation much time and thought. Thus, as an example, in arranging the feasts of the month of February, according to the martyrology of St. Cyriacus, which had been copied and highly praised by no less an authority than Cardinal Baronius, they came across an unmistakable error. For a long time they labored at righting it, but their efforts seemed useless. Finally they determined to consult the original. To do this they were obliged to correspond with and ask the aid of Cardinal Carafa, in whose possession the original lay. Through his kindly services they obtained a transcription of the whole manuscript, and compared it with their own copy. It then became manifest that the first transcriber had omitted a line. By this inadvertency various martyrs who had suffered at different times and places figured as having suffered together, and were, therefore, commemorated in the same feast. We can readily understand that errors of this kind could be overcome only by untiring patience joined to great energy, and that time and money were both required to straighten things out. Neither were difficulties such as we have described few. Yet the unflagging labor and learned skill of the saintly workers and their successors have triumphed over all, and given to the world that grand monument of Christian learning and research which has stood the severest criticisms of infidelity and heresy.

In 1641 Bolland and his companion went to Louvain on business connected with the publication of the work. Whilst there he fell grievously ill, and doubted if he could longer continue his task. He talked in a most melancholy manner about the prospective failure of the great design, and regretted that so much money had been expended upon it. It looked, indeed, as if Louvain were to be the burial-place of the uncompleted "Acta." For, whilst Henschen was celebrating the Holy Sacrifice before the bed on which Bolland lay sick, he was himself taken down with a violent fever. In a short time his life was despaired of, and all work upon the "Acta" was abandoned. However, Henschen soon

recovered, and returned to Antwerp, to which town Bolland was afterwards conveyed. For eight long months Bolland was unable to devote himself to any serious study. During this period the burden of the labor fell upon Henschen, and whatever progress was made was due to his efforts. By degrees Bolland's strength returned, and he set himself again to his task. In the following year, 1643, thirteen years after the undertaking had been begun, he brought out two large volumes for January, which contained the acts and lives of over eleven hundred Saints. Moreover, we are assured by his historian that a still greater number than this was cast aside, because of inaccuracies, errors, and a want of corroborative proof of alleged deeds.

As might have been expected, the publication of the first volumes brought a host of congratulatory letters to Bolland from every literary centre. Encouraged by these signs, he set himself eagerly to complete the February numbers. Had his health continued good, he would soon have accomplished this. But his strength gave out. His old disease returned, and with it he was assailed by asthma, vertigo, and other serious complications. His doctors ordered him to the waters of Spa. As he journeyed to this place he, for the first time during his many years in the Society, saw his relatives. His afflictions increased, and became almost unendurable. He could not walk without crutches. To his other diseases was added the excruciating agony of stone. The physicians acknowledged themselves unable to help him. In this extremity he turned himself to the Saints whose lives he was writing. Through their power, he tells us, he was so far cured that he was able, without difficulty, to continue his labors. In the meantime, the days had lengthened into months, and the months into years, and the promised February numbers were not forthcoming. In truth, fifteen years elapsed between the appearance of the January and February portions of the work.

Further excuse is to be made for Bolland because of his surroundings. The room which he occupied for many years was at the top of a gabled house, and was small and badly lighted. It was impossible to have two assistants in it at once. Heaps of manuscripts lay in every direction, and books were piled in all corners and odd nooks. To Bolland all this was order. He could at a moment's notice place his hand on any book or writing which he needed; but not so his assistants. Like many other literary men, he often found them stumbling blocks. They would fail to return the books and manuscripts to their proper places after use, and thus occasion a serious loss of time. Again, the order of his room, with its big piles of books scattered here and there, was perfectly unintelligible to his assistants, who could never find the documents

which they needed, nor spare the time to rummage amongst such a seemingly disorderly mass of papers. Writers can best appreciate the vexations caused by this state of things, and can readily understand how the temporary loss of a single sheet could delay, even for months, the appearance of a volume. They can likewise justly estimate the spirit of patience and long-suffering which must have ruled the heart of Bolland, when he could resign himself contentedly to such misfortune, and not, at times, break his crutch over the back of his unlucky assistant.

As might be expected, his room bore all the appearance of an antiquarian museum. Reliable writers inform us that in richness of both manuscripts and authors it by far surpassed the famous Barberini collection at Rome and the library of Mazarin in Paris. Yet was it interesting only to scholars, for rich bindings were wanting, and no ornamentation decorated the walls. Schenkel, who at that time was considered to be the possessor of the richest and rarest collection of coins and works of art in all Flanders, and to whose house scholars came from all sides, went one day, impelled by curiosity, to the little room of Bolland. He had heard many talk of it, and desired to see if it justified the common report. "Like Queen Saba before Solomon," says the annalist, "Schenkel was speechless. Considering the number and value of the books and manuscripts gathered into this little corner from all parts of the world, he lost heart in his own collection, and declared that he had never before seen anything equal to it." Then, continues the writer, "no longer thinking of his display of coins, he went whence he had come, an astonished man." The Elector of Brandenburg, a great lover of literature, spent many pleasant hours in this queer garret; and Christina, of Sweden, after her abdication, was also pleased to visit this sanctuary of learning. In return for the interest manifested in his enterprise by the exiled queen, Bolland presented her with an advance copy of the life of St. Anscharius, Bishop of Hamburg and Apostle of the Danes and Swedes, such as it appears in the "Acta" for the third of February.

In 1658 the February numbers were brought out. They consisted of three immense volumes in which the acts of over a thousand Saints were commemorated. "The three volumes," says Henschen, "if considered with regard to bulk, would make about six of the size of the tomes of Baronius; but if labor, and study, and research become the standard, they would by many times exceed those of the famous annalist." The reasons given are as follows: that Baronius, having once laid down his chronological system, could make his various dates accord with it; that he was not obliged to enter into the details of every controversy which

had arisen during the Christian era; that he was not bound to give the date and place of birth of every person of whom he spoke; that he could accept as satisfactory testimony the writings of reliable historians, without feeling himself obliged to go back in each and every case to the fountain source for his authority; in fine, that his was a general history of the Church, whilst Bolland's work was a history of its individual saints, bishops, sees, monasteries, and religious orders, and of the errors by which its teachings had at various times been assailed.

Of one thing we are assured: The workers found no little difficulty attending their efforts to sift the true from the false, and to assign to the proper Saint the various recorded deeds. Thus Bolland found by his investigations that the acts of ten different Saints named William, who lived at different times and places, were all attributed to one person. The rectifying of such mistakes brought a storm of opposition against the work from many religious and holy people. These became embittered when they found that in the new book their patrons were shorn of the honors which they had hitherto wrongly received. Yet, so patiently and so clearly did Bolland explain these changes, that the malcontents, as one of them forcibly expressed it, "were obliged to drink their own bile."

When our American writer, Irving, was shown some terrible blunders into which he had fallen concerning Catholics, he promised to have them corrected. But no correction ever came, and the glaring falsehoods are still to be found in his writings. This was not the spirit of Bolland or his *confrères*. They possessed historical honesty in what we may call a supereminent degree. The Superior of the Augustinians writes to Bolland: "We have received the volumes. They are truly wonderful works. Yet, in your life of St. William you have not shown much favor to our Order." We have already stated the reason. Many things had been dropped from his life because they could not be fully substantiated, and other events previously recorded of the Augustinian William had been proven to belong to the "Acta" of other Williams. However, the answer of Bolland was a noble one. "We study ecclesiastical truth," he says. "Show us in what we have deviated from its path, and we will rectify the error. Point out a mistake in our pages, and in fifteen days we will have it published to the whole world." Despite the opposition of the few, the work was received with pleasure and applause by the learned. Its worth was well stated by Pope Alexander VII., when he declared that no book had ever been brought out, or even begun, which was destined to be more useful to the Church, or which would reflect greater glory upon it.

Bolland was now invited to Rome, that there, in the centre of

Christian learning, monuments, and traditions, he might devote himself more thoroughly to his work, and avail himself of those rich and rare documents preserved in the various libraries of the Eternal City. Feeling that old age and failing strength would render so long a journey difficult to him, he regretfully declined the honor. However, he obtained permission from his superiors that his faithful associate, F. Henschen, should go in his stead. He was to be accompanied by another, whose name now comes prominently forward in the history of the "Acta," F. Papebroeck. After spending four months in the preparation of a catalogue of each and every manuscript and book in the possession of Bolland, Henschen and Papebroeck set out upon their journey on the feast of St. Mary Magdalen, 1660.

The history of this journey in search of knowledge and truth reads like a fairy tale. It was a triumphal march from town to town. Bolland accompanied the travellers as far as Cologne. Wherever they stayed, they were received with the greatest kindness by the many friends of the author. Going down the Rhine, they stopped at the historic monastery of Bingen. Here their hearts were gladdened by the sight of the relics of St. Hildegard, and their literary desires satisfied by the perusal of the ancient tomes containing the prophecies of the Saint. Through Spires, Frankfort, and Aschaffenburg they went. At this last town they found a vast pile of matter awaiting their investigation. It had been collected at no little expense and labor by the zealous F. Camans, a member of the Society. He was aware of the coming of the messengers, through the letters of Bolland, at whose request he had drawn together all available manuscripts from the neighboring districts. At Nuremberg the Protestant mayor received them most kindly, and Dilher, the president of the Lutheran consistory, became a subscriber to the work.

Finding, however, that they were apt to be drawn from their task by the princely honors and hospitalities which were heaped upon them, and that these things actually retarded their progress, the Fathers resolved for the future to accept no attentions save those which would be offered them by monastics. Being then in the midst of religious, whose customs were much in accordance with their own, and in whose libraries were many of the manuscripts after which they were seeking, they would be better able to prosecute their work. Through dread of the difficulties attending the crossing of the Alps at this season of the year, they turned their course towards Trent. Here they were unwillingly and, as they say, unprofitably detained for a week by the incessant rains and the consequent rising of the streams. From Trent they went to Verona, and thence to Venice, where they spent ten days. Here

they found many valuable documents in the great library of St. Mark's and the no less famous establishment of St. George's monastery. Here, also, they came across those rich Greek manuscripts from which Lipomanus had drawn such wonderful material for his edition of the Lives of the Saints. We may form a better judgment of the value of these writings from the fact that Bolland had given the Fathers positive orders to see these treasures, and, if necessary, to transcribe them *verbatim*. From this place, also, they sent to Bolland, as the first result of their labors, several large cases filled with such books, manuscripts, and copies as they had been able to obtain. Of their zeal in this labor of love we can form an opinion when we consider that in midwinter they travelled thirty miles on foot to Ravenna, that they might not pass unvisited this ancient city of Saints. They considered themselves well repaid for this journey by the sight of the monuments and manuscripts in the possession of the archbishop, and by the permission granted them to decipher and copy many valuable papers which time had partially destroyed. Thus they went from town to town, travelling now on foot, now on horse, making detours, now to visit a monastic library, now to kneel at the shrine of some Saint, everywhere investigating, transcribing, and collecting all things which might be of possible service in the great work, till at last they stood before the walls of the Eternal City.

It was soon noised abroad that the agents of Bolland were in Rome. The liberal-minded scholars of the Eternal City gave them a most cordial welcome. Canon Mari, one of the most eminent scholars of the day, invited them to become guests of his house, that there at their leisure they might inspect and avail themselves of the magnificent collection of manuscripts which he had gathered with much care and prudence during many years. Abbot Ughelli, the author of the "Religious History of Italy," likewise made them welcome under his roof. He showed them with a gleam of pleasure two immense piles of manuscripts which he had collected. The travellers' eyes glistened as they looked at the treasures. They begged the privilege of transcribing such of them as might be of use. To this request Ughelli replied most nobly: "No, but take them as they stand, for Bolland is much more worthy of them than I am." It was, perhaps, one of the richest bequests which was made to the Fathers. From it were obtained the "Acts" of sixty Saints not to be found in any other collection. Through the good offices of Cardinal Francisci and F. Marchesi, the celebrated Barberini and Vallicellani collections were opened to them. In these they found sufficient material to keep their scribes occupied for months. Finally the great library of the Vatican was placed at their disposal. The anathemas against

taking books or manuscripts from the archives were, in their case, suspended. Making a short excursion to Naples, they had the pleasure of venerating the relics of St. Januarius, and became eye-witnesses of the liquefaction. They also visited the library of Monte Casino. Finding here valuable papers written in Lombard characters, they gave orders to have copies taken, and returned to Rome.

Doubtless the reader will have concluded that these travels, and the employment of so many men in transcribing, must necessarily have entailed great expense. But generous friends arose, who supplied the needed funds, and thus the Fathers were enabled to continue the work without interruption. Nor was there in their daily life much of that "*dolce far niente*" so commonly read of in novels and poetry about Italy. Arising before dawn, they had finished their Mass and Office, and were seated at their desks in the midst of their labors, before the sun had shot his morning rays across the horizon. The small hours of the night found them still employed, and often the midnight bell had rung the contemplative Orders to Matins ere the industrious laborers had put aside their pens. But figures are strong and stubborn things, and tell a tale the quickest. In this journey to Rome the Fathers obtained the authentic "*Acts*" of over a thousand Saints whose names alone had formerly been known. Nor does this number include over four hundred of whose histories some few things were known but not well established.

The Superior of the Oratory of Sta. Maria in Vallicella invited the travellers to make their home with him. As an incentive, he promised them the use of the numberless authentic manuscripts collected by Baronius and his companions in the preparation of the great "*Annals*." He likewise promised to supply them with scribes who would copy with careful diligence whatever they might consider as of value. Pope Alexander VII. received them most graciously, gave them private audiences, and aided them by every means in his power. This he did, as he himself said, "*because of the high esteem in which he held Bolland.*" They had never met, but for years before Alexander's elevation to the Holy See they had carried on an extensive correspondence. Besides removing in their favor all the anathemas of the Vatican Library, the Pontiff also took off all restrictions from the various collections throughout Italy. In a laughing tone he said that if he cancelled the laws relative to the different libraries, he would do it for the sake of one whose merits so far exceeded those of all others using the libraries that he was not to be included in laws made for them.

Leaving Rome, the Fathers went to Florence, where they re-

mained from the middle of October till the following February. Most of the labor in this place devolved upon themselves, inasmuch as but few could be found with a sufficient knowledge of the old Greek characters to render reliable transcriptions. The Grand Duke and his court proved valuable friends to the fathers, aiding the enterprise by their money, their time and their learning. The grateful travellers designate them in their letters as "new Mæcenases," and assert that no surer path was open to the royal court than that of letters. They call their visit to Florence a "sacred hunt," in which noble vied with noble in the search for documents which might be of service to Bolland. Here they also found a number of valuable Greek originals, which contained the "Acts" of many Eastern Saints. Then, too, they were ably assisted by Senator Strossi, the most learned man in all Florence. He was styled the "Cyclopædia," from the fact that he was familiar with every branch of science and was called on by all classes of people to give off-hand decisions on all classes of subjects. He was the fortunate possessor of a number of manuscripts of ancient legends. These he had at various times purchased at a merely nominal figure from the tradesmen, who, ignorant of their value as historical relics, were using them as wrapping-paper.

At Milan, through the efforts of Count Borromeo, they were afforded the unusual privilege of borrowing and transcribing from the immense Ambrosian library. Leaving Milan towards the end of May, they turned their faces homeward. But before leaving Italy they dispatched to Bolland a parcel of manuscripts weighing one hundred and twenty pounds. Their return journey was slow, but far from being tedious. Diverging from their path that they might obtain greater information, they visited many abbeys and monasteries. These digressions were invariably made on foot, although Henschen was then over sixty. It was in one of these excursions that they found the martyrology compiled by the Venerable Bede. In another they came across the manuscript of the "Acts" and miracles of St. Edmund of Canterbury. As might be expected, they visited Paris and there unearthed many treasures from the wonderful Mazarin and Sequier collections. Strange to say, they encountered more difficulties in obtaining permission to transcribe from the Paris libraries than from those of all Italy. Had it not been for the friendly intervention of the King's confessor it is more than probable that they would have been compelled to leave Paris without having secured a single copy of value. At Auge (or Eu) they had the happiness of venerating the body of St. Lawrence of Dublin and of finding an account of his miracles written in a quaint style. The Fathers arrived at Antwerp on December 2d, 1662, after an absence of twenty-nine months. We need not say that they were cordially welcomed by Bolland. His

heart went out completely to them. He had been anxiously awaiting their return. Old age was on him and he was desirous of completing his task, if possible, before death should claim him.

It was the wish of Bolland, when the Fathers had again settled down to work with him, to issue a new volume every two months; that is, as rapidly as the presses could bring them out. But again were they doomed to disappointment. A half year slipped by and apparently nothing had been done. The time had been spent in getting things into working order. More time was consumed in arranging the new matter. Then it was found that because of the great amount of new material new indexes were absolutely necessary. In this way the appearance of the work was impeded till 1665, when the first volume for March was brought out. It was the last which Bolland saw. Before the next had been issued he had passed away, worn out by disease.

The work, however, did not die. It was continued by his associates, Papebroeck and Henschen. Before the death of the latter the twenty-fourth volume had been prepared. The imperial house of Austria lent a helping hand to the cause by giving a subsidy from the State Treasury. In this way volume appeared after volume till the suppression of the Society of Jesus naturally brought about the separation of the workers and the discontinuance of the work. The outspoken and courageous protests of various Belgian abbots during revolutionary periods prevented the scattering of the grand library. It finally became the property of the Premonstratensians, by whom the publication was continued. But at the breaking out of the French Revolution disaster came. The library was scattered. A portion of it was hurriedly carried into Westphalia, a portion was secreted in various hiding places, and, unfortunately, a portion was consumed by fire. On the return of peace the treasures were again brought out into the light of day. Many of them found their way into the present royal collection at The Hague, more into the Burgundian collection at Brussels, whilst others are in the possession of the continuators of the work at Louvain. Two hundred and forty years have passed since the publication of the first volume, and the work is still incomplete. Sixty-one folio volumes have appeared, bringing the work down to the end of October, and years may yet elapse before the last volume for December appears. But when it comes it will crown the work and be a glory to Bolland, the Jesuits, and the Church.

To sum up, we may say that in the Bollandist collection we have the amplest refutation of the silly calumny that the monks of the Church were lazy or idle members of society; we have positive testimony from the various monasteries of the jealous care with which letters and arts were preserved by these children of the Church, and of the loving interest which the Pope and Court of

Rome manifested in literary matters. Doubtless Bolland did not foresee these points which would make his work so valuable as historical evidence against the falsehoods of our age, but the glory redounds to him and to the Society to which he belonged. His was an humble life, but its results were great to letters and the Church.

Are we, then, asking too much from our readers who have time, talent and inclination, when we bid them delve into this fertile soil, and to open out for the benefit of Catholic youth and maturity these beautiful fruits of God's garden? Our Catholic people must have reading, and we know of nothing which will so meet their wants to-day in their efforts to overcome the infidel tendencies of the age as the sayings and doings of the Saints of God, portrayed in biographies which, whilst replete with literary excellence, will contain none the fewer truths.

WAS ST. AUGUSTINE A CATHOLIC?

THERE are, perhaps, no two works of St. Augustine that have found such general favor with the Christian world as his "City of God" and his "Confessions." This is evident from the numerous editions of both that have appeared even from the earliest days which followed the invention of printing. The former, a mine of erudition and philosophy, with or without learned commentary (like that of Ludovicus Vivés) was the delight of all scholars. The latter charmed the heart of all Christian readers, high and low, learned and unlearned, for it detailed with noble simplicity and humble candor the successive steps by which, despite the struggles of fallen nature and the hindrances of sinful habit, the soul of this great hero and Saint was by God's grace lifted out of the mire of heresy and sin, and led triumphantly to Catholic truth and holiness of life. Some have thought fit to compare the confessions of Goethe and Rousseau with those of St. Augustine. But the comparison, even when meant by way of contrast, is profane and shocking. Such vile Pagans ought not to be mentioned in the same breath with our great Saint.

The present volume contains the Confessions and Letters of St. Augustine, his "City of God" being reserved for the second volume. Dr. Schaff¹ seems to question the wisdom of some parts of the Confessions. The reason given is a very strange one: had he not confessed, his sins would have remained hidden from the knowledge of men. Nothing, probably, was farther from the intention of Dr. Schaff; but we must say his juxtaposition of Augustine's lack of wisdom with the disclosure of his sins, which otherwise would never have become known, recalls forcibly an ugly trait that entered largely into Puritan morality, from the so-called martyrs and confessors of the Marian era down to the days of Oliver Cromwell and his fellow "saints." Their main point of holiness seems to have consisted not so much in avoiding sin as in the virtuous endeavor to prevent its being found out by their brother-members in church or congregation.² St. Augustine wrote for Christian Catholics, and cared nothing for the respectable position that he might keep or lose in the eyes of Pagan society. If he thought of them at all, it was to teach his brethren, or inculcate what they already knew, that the true nature of sin is to be judged by the unchangeable standard of Revelation and the Gospel, and not by the shifting caprices of heathens and worldlings.

Should any over-righteous or oversensitive critic venture to say that the avowals of the Saint are not "unto edification," in the language of the Apostle, we have the right to answer boldly that God's Saints are not to be judged by ordinary rules. For, though not inspired, they were led by the Spirit of God,³ and being thus His children and friends in a special way, it may well be held as

¹ "The wisdom of some parts of the *Confessions* may be doubted. The world would never have known Augustine's sins if he had not told them; nor were they of such a nature as to destroy his respectability in the best heathen society of his age; but we must all the more admire his honesty and humility." Prolegomena, p. 12.

² See Rev. Dr. Maitland, "Essays on Subjects connected with the Reformation in England," London (Rivingtons), 1849, *passim*. They had also a convenient maxim which they cherished in practice, though they were too wise to avow it in theory, viz.: Evil may be done that good may come of it. The Reformers availed themselves to a great extent of this crooked morality, as may be seen from their private letters and public documents. When the evil maxim had served their purpose and that of their children the latter turned round, and in utter contempt of truth as well as gratitude attempted to fasten its paternity on the Jesuits. F. Roh, a distinguished member of the Society, offered to give a thousand florins to any one who could point out this detestable principle in any book written by a Jesuit, the decision to rest with the Faculty of Bonn (mixed), or that of Heidelberg (Protestant). This offer he made on three solemn occasions, in Frankfort (1852), in Halle (1862), and in Bremen (1863), begging his hearers, Catholic and Protestant, to give his offer the widest circulation. The thousand florin prize yet remains unclaimed. See GESCHICHTSLÜGEN, Eine Widerlegung landläufiger Einstellungen auf dem Gebiete der Geschichte mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Kirchengeschichte. Aufs neue bearbeitet. Vierte Auflage. Paderborn (Schöningh), 1885, pp. 530-33.

³ "Quicumque enim Spiritu Dei aguntur, hi sunt filii Dei." Rom. viii., 14.

certain that they wrote and acted under His special guidance. If, therefore, St. Augustine was moved to confess his wanderings and sins, it was from his Father in Heaven that the impulse came. And the way in which he has performed his work does not dishonor Him who prompted it. It does not offend but edify the Christian reader. It discloses on every page a spirit of deep humility, candid self-reproach, and warmest thanksgiving to the divine Hand that led him so gently yet so forcibly out of darkness into light. Even Dr. Schaff cannot help admiring the honesty and humility of the writer.¹

In the volume before us the *Confessions* are translated and annotated by Rev. J. G. Pilkington, the *Letters* by Rev. J. G. Cunningham, though the notes of the latter have been added with more sparing and judicious hand. It is chiefly with the former that we shall have to deal. The publishers told us unreservedly that the object of this Library "is historical, without any sectarian or partisan aim." And Dr. Schaff himself, by informing us in his Preface that a similar collection was prepared by Roman Catholic scholars of Germany² "in the interest of their Church,"³ and that the Oxford Library was undertaken in the interest of the neo-Catholic Anglican Church, or as he gently phrases it, "not so much for an historical as for an apologetic and dogmatic purpose,"⁴ would seem to intimate that the Library which he undertook to edit would not be compiled in the interest of any Church or sect, but would commend itself to all readers by the careful avoidance of all partisan spirit. How has this promise, not directly uttered but surely implied, been kept? It was not to be feared that at this late day any scholar, with a reputation to lose, would tamper with the text by translating amiss the words of the holy Doctor. But there are more ways of misleading readers than by mistranslation. An unscrupulous annotator, sometimes by cunning insinuation, sometimes by the very reckless boldness of his gloss, will misinterpret and pervert the meaning of the text, so as to delude the unwary. Of what use is it, then, to the ordinary reader to have before his eyes a tolerably fair translation, if the poison that is to prey upon his mind, warping and deceiving his intelligence, lies artfully hidden in a note?

Now, there is on this very score just cause of complaint against the notes appended to the *Confessions*. Rev. Dr. Schaff has adopted the translation and notes of Rev. Mr. Pilkington. But the latter has intermingled with his own notes some from the pen of Dr. Pusey and others from an Anglican Low-Churchman, Rev.

¹ Loc. cit.

² Dr. Thalhöfer and Dr. Reithmayr.

³ Prolegom., p. 2.

⁴ Prol., p. 1.

Wm. Watts, who lived over two centuries ago. So that Dr. Schaff has made himself responsible for them all. In Pilkington's translation we have scarcely found anything to blame. But in his notes there is covert, yet real and on the face of it intentional, misrepresentation of the doctrine of St. Augustine and the Catholic Church. With Dr. Pusey's notes we can find no fault. Watts is nothing more than a blatant bigot, caring no more for honesty or courtesy, where the Catholic Church was to be attacked, than did any Puritan polemic of his day.

To give an example: No one who has read the Confessions can fail to recall the ardent prayer which holy Monica addressed to her children immediately before her death. "Trouble not yourselves about this body of mine, but lay it to rest anywhere. This only I beg of you, that wherever you may be, you be mindful of me at the altar of the Lord."¹ The Saint complied faithfully with her dying request, and on the day of burial had the Holy Sacrifice offered up for her; during which the two brothers added their own prayers on behalf of her departed soul. We give his own words. He says that though consumed by inward sorrow, the relief of tears was denied him "even during those prayers which we poured forth unto Thee, while the Sacrifice of our Redemption was offered up ON HER BEHALF."²

There is no Catholic mother, no Catholic child in the centres of European civilization, or in our own remotest backwoods, no illiterate Greek, Eutychian or Nestorian in the farthest East, that would not, in hearing of Monica's pious prayer and Augustine's discharge of filial duty, intuitively recognize the Christian meaning which was in the minds of both. But the Anglican, Watts, having exchanged primitive Christianity for the Thirty-nine Articles, can not rise to the level of a Catholic child or even of the benighted Eastern heretic. He does not or will not understand Augustine's words, and becomes indignant when they are taken in their obvious Catholic sense. Here is his note, approved by Pilkington and Dr. Schaff:

"Here my Popish translator³ says that the Sacrifice of the Mass

¹ "Tantum illud vos rogo ut ad Domini altare memineritis mei, ubi fueritis." Confess. ix., ch. xi., No. 27.

² "Neque in iis precibus quas Tibi fudimus, cum offerretur PRO EA Sacrificium pretii nostri." Ibid. xii., No. 32. Pilkington, too, translates *Sacrificium pretii nostri* by "Sacrifice of Our Redemption." After the words "offered up" he adds "unto Thee," which is not in the original, and is quite unnecessary. For, according to the teaching of the Church, sacrifice can be offered to none but God alone. Hence, as St. Augustine says, "to sacrifice to a martyr would be a sin, but it is no sin to offer sacrifice to God at the shrines of the martyrs." (Contra Faustum, Lib. xx., cap. 21.)

³ This must refer to Sir Toby Matthews, who published a translation of the Confessions in 1624, since the next Catholic translator, Abraham Woodhead, did not re-

was offered for the dead. That the ancients had communion with their burial, I confess. But for what? (1) To testify their dying in the communion of the Church. (2) To give thanks for their departure. (3) To pray God to give them place in his Paradise, (4) and a part in the first resurrection; but not as a propitiatory sacrifice to deliver them out of which the Mass is now only meant for.”¹

Prescinding from its falsehoods, it is hard to keep from admiring in some way the cool impudence of this note. What has the “Popish translator” said in English that St. Augustine had not said before him in Latin? The Saint says it was offered up *for her* (pro ea). Was she not *dead* and on the point of being buried? Then it was offered up for the dead, and the plain language of St. Augustine ought to have been, and no doubt was, just as plain to Watts as to Sir Toby. The only difference is that one was honest, the other was not. But *what* was offered up for the dead woman? The sacrifice of the Mass, says our English Catholic; the sacrifice of our redemption, says the Holy Doctor. Is there any difference between the two expressions? None at all. The Catholic Fathers use as synonymous the terms—Mass, Sacrifice of the New Law, Sacrifice of the Redemption or of the Altar,² or the Church’s daily sacrifice.³ And, in our day, a Catholic means always the same thing, whether he ask to be remembered at Mass, or at the Holy Sacrifice, or at the Altar, as St. Monica expressed herself on her death-bed.

Watts continues: “That the ancients had *communion* with their burials, I confess.” Let his confession go for as much as it may be worth; it has nothing to do with the matter under discussion. Going to communion is one thing; saying Mass is another. What

nounce Anglicanism until 1666. Watts published his edition in 1631; Dr. Schaff adds another of 1650. It is not known in what year Woodhead made his translation, but it was not published until a year after his death (1679). Dr. Pusey says that Sir Tobey Matthews’s translation is “inaccurate and subservient to Romanism.” We see no reason why we should take his mere word for it. Perhaps he judged solely from this note of Watts. A Catholic is better able to understand and explain St. Augustine than any professed enemy of the Saint’s teaching. At all events, Watts, Pilkington, and Dr. Schaff have clearly shown that a translation (with notes) of his works can be made subservient in no small degree to the interests of Protestantism.

¹ “Confessions of St. Augustine,” p. 137.

² Thus St. Augustine in his *Enchiridion*. Opera S. Augustine, Paris, 1837, vol. vi., p. 403.

³ *Quotidianum Ecclesiae Sacrificium*. St. Augustine De Civitate Dei, Lib. x., cap. 20, vol. 7, p. 911. St. Gregory the Great uses the same expression. St. Augustine uses more than once the term Mass (Vid. Sermon. xlix, De Tempore, Tom. v., p. 392), and that in its primitive meaning, to wit, the initial ceremony in the celebration of the sacred mysteries, which was the *dismissal* of the catechumens who were not allowed to be present at the Sacrifice of the Altar. St. Ambrose, his teacher, makes frequent use of the same word.

St. Monica desired was that she should be remembered *at the altar* of the Lord ; and her son tells us that the Sacrifice of our Redemption (the Sacrifice of the *Altar*, as he himself used to call it) was offered up for her before her burial. No doubt her children, relatives and friends went to communion during the Mass. But this, being a matter of course, is not mentioned by the Saint. Since Watts has misstated the whole question by substituting (in the teeth of St. Augustine's plain narrative) communion for Mass, we are not bound to take any notice of his subsequent reasons. Nevertheless, we will examine them, singly, that Watts's dishonesty (there is no other word for it) may appear more fully. His first reason is "to testify their dying in the communion of the Church." In other words: The kinsmen or friends of the deceased went to communion to *testify* that he had died in the communion of the Church. The writer had clearly a motive, and no good one, in giving the word *communion* two different senses in a breath. How different the effect, if his thought had been correctly worded, viz., the survivors received the Holy Sacrament to testify that the departed had died in the communion of the Church ! But, apart from this, the assertion is a clear case of the sophism, *non causa pro causa*. That the deceased should have died in the communion of the Church was a *conditio sine qua non* ; and without it no believer would receive the Holy Sacrament on his behalf. If a man wish to marry a woman, it is an essential condition that she be single, that is, unmarried or undivorced ; he surely does not marry her to bear witness that she is single. So, too, the Catholic of former ages, being fully aware, either from his own knowledge or some trustworthy witness, that the deceased had ended his life in the communion of the Catholic Church, performed a work of duty or of charity, as the case might be, by giving him the benefit of his Communion, or, in the language of St. Augustine, remembered him at the Altar by receiving on his behalf the Sacrament of the Altar. The same is the teaching and practice of the Church in our own day.

His second reason is "to give thanks for their departure." What could be more absurd ? Were Christians, in those days, bound by duty or usage to go to communion on the day of burial, in order to thank God for bereaving them of those whom they loved most dearly ? Was the child to thank God for depriving him of his parents ; the husband and wife, to thank Him for taking away the partner of their affections, the closest sharer of their joys and sorrows ; the friend and relative, to rejoice and give thanks for the loss of one who had for years grown into their hearts by lasting ties of love or kindred ? Surely, this is a degree of heroic virtue, a high state of Christian perfection that could be neither exacted nor expected of our fathers in the faith. But is it Christian per-

fection? Watts may have thought so. Perhaps he was a fatalist in religion; in other words, a Calvinist, and firm believer in the inevitable, "horrible decrees,"¹ as Calvin himself calls them. Though enjoying the revenues of the Anglican Church, he was not bound by her creed, if she really had one. For, that tender-hearted mother tolerates in her children any vagary of private judgment from semi-Catholicity down to Socinianism and Deism.² According to what may have been Watts's theory, a man and his friends with him ought to praise and thank God for the damnation for which he had been specially created. But the Catholic Church has never held, never tolerated such dreadful doctrine. She makes no boast of crushing out those feelings which are a part of the human nature given us by God. She only tells us that we are bound to hold them in subordination to God's holy will, made known to us through His commandments or through the dispensations of His Providence. When we lose those who are near or dear to us, we are not forbidden to mourn and weep over our loss. It is enough to bow to His holy Will with unfeigned resignation, and to recognize that it is the chastening hand of a loving Father that has sent us our affliction. As the great body of Christians in St. Augustine's day, as well as in the ages that went before or came after him, were Catholics, and believed firmly that God was the source and author, not the persecutor or destroyer, of human nature, we may safely conclude that reason No. 2 is nonsense or perhaps something worse.

But Watts is not alone to blame. Dr. Schaff falls very little behind him. Commenting on the dying words of St. Monica, "Be mindful of me at the Altar of the Lord, wheresoever you may be," he says: "This must be explained from the already-prevailing custom of offering prayers for the dead, which, however, had rather the form of thanksgiving for the mercy of God shown to them than the later form of intercession for them."³ What a wretched thing it is to fear the truth, and thus be driven to dodge around in quest of by-ways and other devices to elude it? We would fain ask of Dr. Schaff a question or two. Did St. Augustine write in Hebrew or old Phœnician,⁴ so that his scanty vocabulary necessa-

¹ "Decretum HORRIBILE fateor," says Calvin, speaking of those who departed this life to incur the flames of hell which they had never deserved.

² Watts, being an adherent of Charles I., was, of course, no Presbyterian. But he may, for all that, have been a Calvinist. For, Calvinism was the primitive creed of the Anglican Church, and it was only when the Episcopal faction (the Prelatists, as their enemies called them) gained the upper hand, that Arminian actions began to grow in favor with Churchmen.

³ *Prolégomena*, p. 4, in note.

⁴ St. Augustine was thoroughly acquainted with the Punic or Phœnician language of his day. It is the language that most closely resembles the Hebrew. No doubt,

rily drew with it ambiguity of diction, as must perforce happen to any scholar who, nowadays, should attempt to write a Catholic theology in those dead languages? Did he not, on the contrary, write in the world-known language of his day, ample in its abundant phraseology, adequate to express every shade of thought and as readily understood by modern scholars of our time as when he wrote for his contemporaries? Or, had the noble Roman speech of Tully become at last so degenerate, so poor in words that in the days of Lactantius, Jerome and Augustine it was unable to distinguish any longer between *thanksgiving* and *supplication*? An ignorant reader would be tempted to suppose this from the labored efforts of Watts, Pilkington, Dr. Schaff and other Protestant controversialists, to confound these ideas in the mind and mouth of St. Augustine and to make out that in speaking of prayer and supplication he must have meant nothing more than thanksgiving. St. Augustine can readily decide for himself whether he labored or not under any such confusion of ideas as anti-Catholic bigotry with wicked persistence imputes to him.

In his answer to the "Eight Questions of Dulcitius" the Saint says expressly: "It cannot be denied that the souls of the dead are relieved by the piety of their surviving relatives when the Sacrifice of the Mediator (Christ) is offered up on their behalf, or almsgiving (for the good of their souls) is done in the Church."¹ Here, it must be noted, the Saint says nothing about *thanksgiving*. He says in unmistakable language that the souls of the faithful departed are prayed for, benefited, helped, RELIEVED (RELEVANTUR) by Christ's Holy Sacrifice of the Altar and also by the good works, such as almsgivings, of their pious relatives who survive them. There is no mention here of thanksgiving for the departed having been taken away, no testimony that they died in the communion

in his time in its somewhat degenerate form, it bore almost the same relation to the old Phœnician that Italian does to Latin or modern Arabic (*l'Arabo Volgare*, as the *Lingua Franca* calls it) to the old language of Yemen, mother or eldest representative of all Semitic tongues. That St. Augustine himself used the language with children, country people, and older domestics is highly probable. St. Jerome knew it only as a learned man and scholar. See Gesenius, "*Scripturæ Linguæque Phœnicæ Monumenta quot-quot supersunt*," Lipsiæ (Guil. Vogel). 1837, pp. 331, 340. The Saint says somewhere in his works that in his day the Punic tongue had gone out of use, conquered by the growing universality of Rome's language, but we are unable to recall the passage of his writings where this is stated. All the Phœnician inscriptions (and that is the only shape in which the language has survived), whether from Carthage, Numidia, Egypt, or Cyprus, testify to the short, incisive character in which every thought was expressed. No words were wasted, but a great deal was left to the reader's study and contemplation.

¹ Neque negandum est defunctorum animas pietate suorum Viventium RELEVARI, cum PRO ILLIS Sacrificium Mediatoris offertur, vel eleemosynæ in Ecclesia fiunt." De Octo Dulciti Quæstionibus Liber Unus. S. Augustini Opera, Paris ed. of 1837, vol. vi., p. 222.

of the Church. It is simply the doctrine of the Council of Trent that the faithful departed are helped by the Sacrifice of the Mass and the suffrages, good works, prayers, etc., of those whom they leave behind them. St. Augustine shows us in another work how well he knew the difference between thanksgiving and propitiatory prayer. In his "Enchiridion" (or Manual of Faith, Hope and Charity, addressed to Laurence, a priest or deacon of the Roman clergy) he speaks of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass offered up for the dead. "For some," he says, "no intercession is needed; they have died full of grace and in God's friendship. For them the Holy Sacrifice is only Eucharistic, or an offering of thanks; for those who are not so good, the sacrifice is propitiatory; for those who are very bad and cannot be helped thereby, it is nevertheless a solace to the living to think they have done their best for the sake of their departed."¹ What is needed, after these quotations, to ascertain what St. Augustine held about the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and its being propitiatory for the faithful departed?

We come back to Rev. Mr. Watts's note, adopted and endorsed by Rev. Mr. Pilkington and Dr. Schaff. He says in his No. 3 that the ancients went to communion "to pray God to give them (the departed) place in His Paradise." Now in what does this differ from the Creed of Trent and of the Catholic Church in every age? If prayer was needed or useful to obtain for them a place in Paradise, they evidently were not entitled to it by right, but the favor came from Almighty God, moved to pity by the prayers and suffrages of the surviving faithful and, above all, by the oblation of the Holy Sacrifice; communion, prayers and almsgiving (and they were freely given) would help; but the main thing was the Sacrifice of the Altar, the Sacrifice of our Redemption, the Daily Sacrifice, the Sacrifice of our Mediator (these are all expressions of St. Augustine) that was chiefly relied on to benefit the departed soul. Rev. Mr. Watts, endorsed by Rev. Dr. Schaff, goes on to say that the Sacrifice of the Mass, "the Communion," as he falsely and ridiculously calls it, "was not a propitiatory sacrifice to deliver them out of purgatory, which the Mass is now only meant for."

How are we to answer this clumsy, ungainly, un-English rubbish of Rev. Mr. Watts? The idea that Mass is never said except to deliver souls out of Purgatory is false, and Mr. Watts knew it as well as any priest or Catholic layman knows it. We say Mass for a thousand reasons: to thank God for His favors, to beseech

¹ "Cum ergo sacrificia sive altaris sive quarumcumque eleemosynarum pro baptizatis defunctis omnibus offeruntur, pro valde bonis gratiarum actiones sunt; pro non valde malis propitiationes sunt; pro valde malis etiamsi nulla sunt adjumenta mortuorum, qualescumque vivorum consolationes sunt." *Enchiridion ad Laurent.*, § 29, *Opp. S. August.*, vol. vi., p. 703, Ed. Paris.

His mercies as we need them. We do not know what is in the Divine counsels, but judge according to the best of our ability. Down South, during the war, we said Mass to commemorate every victory we obtained, while up North no doubt they gave thanks for every successful battle that enabled them to put our necks under their heel. But it was well and properly meant on both sides. They thanked God for what they judged, wisely or not, the good issue of the right cause. We say Mass in times of public calamity to avert God's anger, to beg of Him mercy, reconciliation and peace. And so, for a thousand other good motives, the Holy Catholic Church offers up the Daily Sacrifice, the Sacrifice of our Redemption—of our Mediator, as St. Augustine calls it. We offer it up, too, as St. Augustine and our other fathers in the faith have taught us, for the welfare of our departed, knowing that it is the best way in which we can help them in the other world, to which they have gone alone and unaided. Our tears and sepulchral offerings testify our own sorrow, but do no good to the departed. It is the Holy Sacrifice that we cause to be offered, our prayers and almsdeeds, as St. Augustine incessantly repeats, that can benefit those "who have gone before us with the sign of faith and sleep the sleep of peace."¹

Rev. Mr. Watts, Mr. Pilkington and Dr. Schaff scout the idea of the Mass being a propitiatory Sacrifice. We could prove this, if necessary, from the New Testament and the concurrent testimony of all the Fathers from Apostolical times down to the sixth and seventh century of our Christian era. But we had rather let a Protestant witness do the work for us. Grabe, perhaps the most learned and honest divine that Protestantism could boast of, after Grotius and Leibnitz, in his annotation on a passage of St. Irenæus (where the Holy Sacrifice and its propitiatory character are clearly established), speaks out his conviction in a manful, honorable way that will be everlastingly to his credit:

"I will not add here what Feuarentius says of the Holy Sacrifice, with his invectives against Luther and Calvin, as they are too long and unseasonable, not that I would deny or conceal their truthfulness. For it is certain that Irenæus and all the Fathers whose writings we possess, whether cotemporaries of the Apostles or their immediate successors, held the Holy Eucharist to be the sacrifice of the New Law. And that this was not the private opinion of any particular Church or teacher, but the public doctrine and practice of the Universal Church, which she received from the Apostles and the Apostles from the teaching of Christ, is

¹ "Qui nos cum signo fidei præcesserunt et dormiunt in somno pacis." Canon of the Mass to be found in any Missal.

here taught by Irenæus, and in his subsequent chapter (24th), and before him by Justin Martyr partially in his Apology (Apol. I. ad Antoninum), and more amply and clearly in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew. Whose words, like those of St. Ignatius, Tertullian, St. Cyprian and others, we care not to quote, as they have been so frequently quoted by Papal theologians (*Pontificiis*) and by the more learned amongst Protestants. I will only allege the words, most undeniably genuine, of Clement of Rome in his Epistle to the Corinthians, because I see that only one writer has given them, and not fully at that." Here Grabe gives the original Greek of St. Clement, with a Latin translation. The substance of it is in English: We must do rightly (*ordine*) everything that the Lord hath commanded us, namely, to perform at stated times offerings and works of the sacred ministry, and not do them rashly or inconsiderately, but in due time and season. Those, therefore, who make their offerings in due time and season are blessed and acceptable before God, because therein they follow God's law and cannot go astray. "But," continues Grabe, "lest this should be understood only of the sacrifices of Jewish priests or the Christian laity, I will add his words that follow: 'It is no light sin if we deprive of their Episcopal office those who blamelessly and holily offer up gifts (sacrifices).' And since the author of this Epistle seems to be that very Clement 'whose name was written in the Book of Life,' as St. Paul writes to the Philippians (ch. iv. : v. 3), and since he wrote what we have quoted only two or three years after the martyrdom of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, and twenty years before the death of St. John (the Evangelist), there is no room to doubt that this doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist came down from the Apostles themselves, and therefore must be held for true, even though there were no text from Prophet or Apostle to back it. The command of St. Paul (2 Thessal. II : 15) is universal in its binding obligation: 'Hold fast, brethren, and keep to the traditions which you have learned from me either by mouth or by letter.' But quite enough of Scripture for the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, after Irenæus and other Holy Fathers, has been brought forward, not only by Papal theologians, but also by Protestants, and especially those of the Anglican communion." He then quotes with special praise the English book of Dr. Joseph Mede on "Christian Sacrifice," and winds up as follows: "I subscribe with my whole heart not only to Mede's opinions, but to his desire and hope expressed at the end of his eighth chapter. I anxiously wish that, since many pious and learned men of the Protestant side have recognized the error of Luther and Calvin, and have acknowledged the true doctrine of the Apostolic Church, they would bring back the use of those holy liturgical forms by which the aforesaid Sacrifice is offered to God, and which in an

evil hour they cast away, and give once more to God this supreme honor due to His majesty.”¹

What Grabe has said of the Sacrifice of the New Law is sufficient to show what he thought of its propitiatory nature. For as the Sacrifices of the Old Law were essentially such, *a fortiori* that of the New Law, which replaces them, must be of the same kind. But Grabe has left us no room to doubt of his opinion. For, in his Oxford MSS. Notes, published for the first time by the editors of Tract No. LXXXI., p. 374, he says distinctly that “in behalf of this opinion (the propitiatory character of the Sacrifice of the Altar) there is a consent of the most ancient Fathers and successors of the Apostles, as is seen scarcely in any mystery of Christian Faith.” The same is clearly put forward in the “Systema Theologicum” of Leibnitz. Whether this great work of the most magnificent Protestant scholar that Europe ever knew be simply an “Opus Irenicum,” as Karl Adolph Menzel and other candid, honest Protestants try *minimisingly* to make out, or whether it be the deliberate result of his study and convictions, it is one of the standard works of European Protestant theology, and bears impartial witness to every point of Catholic doctrine which sectarians have presumed to call in question.

Much more might be said to show how manifestly unqualified Dr. Schaff proves himself to interpret faithfully and correctly the teaching of St. Augustine, or indeed any of the early Doctors of the Catholic Church. And this incapacity arises not only from his very position as a champion of Protestantism, but—as we hope to show more fully in a future article—from his lack of rightly understanding and appreciating the terminology of the language used by the Fathers. It is only by mistranslating or otherwise vitiating the original text of these expounders of Catholic doctrine that they can be made to appear in the eyes of the unwary reader to favor in any way the tenets of heresy.

¹ “Eam quam Feuarentius hic inseruit de Sacrificio Eucharistiæ dissertationem, indeque subnexam in Lutherum et Calvinum, etc., investivam omitto, quod nimis prolixa et intempestiva sit, non quod rem ipsam inficias eam aut subterfugiam. Certum enim est Irenæum ac omnes, quorum scripta habemus, Patres Apostolis sive coævus sive proxime succedentes S. Eucharistiam pro Novæ Legis Sacrificio habuisse. Atque hanc non privatam particularis ecclesiæ vel doctoris sed publicam Universalis Ecclesiæ doctrinam atque praxin fuisse, quam illa ab Apostolis, Apostoli ab ipso Christo edocti acceperunt.” We omit the rest of this note, as we have faithfully translated it in the text. We give its conclusion as of more importance.

“Hujus (Medi, scilicet) non solum sententia sed et voto in fine cap. 8, expresso toto corde subscribo atque opto ut postquam multi pii doctique e parte Protestantium viri hunc Lutheri et Calvinii errorem ac veram Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ doctrinam bene agnoverint, hujus quoque sanctissimas formulas Liturgicas, quibus dictum Deo sacrificium offertur, ab illis male e suis cœtibus proscriptas, in usum revocent et hunc summum Divinæ Majestati honorem de rite reddant.” Grabe’s note, preserved by Massuet (the model editor, if ever there was one), Opera S. Irenæi, Parisiis, 1710, Appendix. p. 162.

WERE THE ACADIANS "REBELS?"

AT Port Royal, not far from the present city of Annapolis, in Nova Scotia, France founded its first permanent settlement in North America. Disease, opposition from the savages, the length and severity of the winters, and the violent storms which sweep that region, rendered many previous attempts at colonization by the same nation abortive. In 1605 the obstacles arising from climate and location were overcome by the sturdy determination of a few patriotic Frenchmen. A beginning once effected, the kings of France expended much wealth, hoping to convert the heathen and to build up a powerful dependency by the mouth of the St. Lawrence.

After a century of disputed dominion little was accomplished toward the colonization scheme beyond disseminating some insecure and struggling settlements over a vast extent of territory. The boundaries of this territory fluctuated with almost every reverse and success of the Colonists' arms. The Kennebec, the Penobscot, the St. Croix, and even the St. John set its limits by turns. After repeated struggles it embraced, with some permanence, Nova Scotia, the islands of Prince Edward and Cape Breton, and New Brunswick. It is probable that this immense tract of land, together with the islands, was known by the name Acadia, though the French Government afterwards contended that L'Acadie designated Nova Scotia only.

In spite of continual war the labors of the missionaries were crowned with great success; but the efforts of the Colonists were foiled at every step by the opposition of the Puritans. England and France were hereditary rivals, and the old national antipathy, intensified by religious hatred, was revived by their sons in the forests and on the rivers and seas of the New Continent.

Acadia, more vulnerable than Canada, and more coveted because commanding the fisheries and the avenue to the Atlantic, became the bone of contention between the rival crowns. On the slightest pretext the people of Massachusetts Bay fitted out hostile armaments to dispute the claims, or to chastise the pretensions, of the French. The ravages of these organized expeditions, and the constant scourge of English pirate vessels, deprived the Acadians of all hope of peace or security.

They were kept in unceasing apprehension for their very lives. Indeed, the destruction of their little settlements was of such frequent occurrence that, like the bird of fable, they may be said to have risen again and again from their own ashes. Thus the gold which annually poured out of France for their relief, was wasted in building forts and procuring the equipments of war.

In extenuation of their implacable hostility the Puritans had one unflinching plea to urge in defence of their multiplied cruelties, viz., that Acadia belonged to England by right of discovery. This visionary claim was founded on the probability that a Venetian, named Cabot, sailing under the British flag, touched the shores of Newfoundland as early as 1498.

The Acadians did not, therefore, develop the resources of the country. Fishing and the peltry trade formed their chief occupation. They were constantly changing masters till they became a sort of target for the avarice and jealousy of the rival monarchs. In 1713, however, they passed forever out of the hands of France. By the treaty of Utrecht Acadia, that is, Nova Scotia, was given to England, while France retained all the islands except Newfoundland. The French of Nova Scotia, numbering about 2500 souls, fell, therefore, under control of a power which they could not but dislike and dread.

They enjoyed, however, a breathing-spell from the ravages of war and piracy. For forty years their new masters did not interfere with them. In consequence of this neglect their industrious, tranquil life was blessed with happiness and prosperity. Time and a favorable situation rendered them loyal and grateful to English rule.

The arrival of Sir Edward Cornwallis in 1749 was the inauguration of changes disastrous to the ill-fated Acadians. Henceforward they received government "protection" with a vengeance. Their numbers and substance had increased marvellously in the interval. Instead of the narrow clearings of 1713 the forest had yielded to the axe far up the hill-sides, presenting extensive meadows to view, and the ocean was shut out from broad acres of rich alluvial soil by huge dikes, like those of the Netherlands. Their fields were covered with flocks and herds, and produced every variety of grain and vegetable. The population had increased to 17,000.

The colony was now prosperous, but no settlement of English people had yet been made there. His Britannic Majesty then turned his attention to the neglected province. With this intent over 2000 persons, "chiefly disbanded soldiers and sailors," were induced to embark with Governor Cornwallis and settle on the spot which then received and still bears the name of Halifax.

It would seem that some years previous to this rumors of alleged disaffection on the part of the Acadians had reached London through the Governors of Port Royal and Massachusetts. A few were caught in arms assisting the enemy. Moreover, the English affected to question the sincerity of their allegiance on account of the form of oath which they had taken, and no threats or inducements could influence them to take the one required of English

subjects. As the wording of this oath apparently furnished the touchstone of future quarrel between the two races, it is as well to give it verbatim.

"We sincerely promise and swear, by the faith of Christians, that we shall be entirely faithful and will truly submit ourselves to his Majesty King George, whom we acknowledge as Sovereign Lord of New Scotland, or Acadia. So God help us."

By this compact they were exempted from the duty of bearing arms, either against the French or Indians, and allowed full freedom of religious worship. By reason of these exemptions they are known in history as the "Neutral French."

The king was not satisfied with neutrality. Cornwallis, therefore, sent a peremptory order to the various settlements to take an unqualified English oath of allegiance or leave the province within three months. When the consternation which so harsh an order spread through the community had subsided, they returned a unanimous refusal, though fully aware that the alternative was to be expatriation, without the right to sell or take away any of their effects.

As most authorities, on the English side, of this forgotten chapter of history condemn the Neutrals for refusing to take the English oath, and some go so far as to justify subsequent British cruelty in consequence, let us ask, did Governor Cornwallis regard the question of allegiance, the real ground of English complaint? Secondly, had these simple peasants any reasons capable of reconciling their action, in their own consciences, with a becoming submission and loyalty to the crown?

In the first place, the Acadians, strictly speaking, were the subjects of no government. To avoid participation in the quarrels perpetually embroiling the two inimical races, they bargained for neutrality with their governors, after the treaty of Utrecht. This, after some reluctance, was agreed to. It was, in fact, the principal condition on which the French consented to remain under the British government; for the treaty gave them the option of passing over to Canada. "This contract," wrote Minot, the historian, "was at several periods revived and renewed to their children, and such was the notoriety of the compact that for half a century they bore the name of Neutrals." But neutrality is an anomaly which no government would tolerate, urged Cornwallis. What did the Acadians know about the sovereign right of kings, or the science of jurisprudence? The governors of Port Royal, in his "Majesty's name," approved of their peculiar political condition, and they had faithfully performed their part of the agreement. Why, then, should an English governor condemn, in 1749, a state of things which an English governor had established in 1713,

and which all those who intervened had sanctioned, by acquiescence or express approval? Because, at the latter date, the Neutrals enjoyed the products of vast tracts of fertile land, while the English colonists, who multiplied the hardships of the pioneers by their laziness, had to begin with hewing down the "forest primeval"; and at the former period the labor of the French was indispensable.

The demand of Governor Cornwallis, then, was not only the violation of a grave and sacred contract, but compliance with it would, as we shall see, have exposed them to many and great dangers. It was a lame reply to make to their expostulations to say that his Britannic Majesty never gave express approval to such an arrangement; for this leaves the whole course of English rule open to the charge of systematic dissimulation, practised upon a simple, guileless people.

It may appear to some an easy matter to take the oath demanded; especially when the doing so seemed to promise "protection" and all the good things of the land. If such would reflect for a moment, they would easily perceive that, if the Acadians had no fears and no suspicion, they would not offer to leave their happy homes and native land forever, rather than subscribe to an oath which was perfectly just in itself. They may have had reasons which they dared not give, and which, probably, will never come to light, owing to the destruction of all their documents by order of Governor Lawrence; but the reasons they did assign for refusal were such as convinced them that neutrality or exile was preferable to putting themselves completely at the mercy of England.

They are as follows: if they took the English oath they would expose themselves to the obligation of fighting against Canada. Though willing to observe a pledge of fidelity to the British crown, they were strongly opposed to taking up arms against their "Bon Roi de France;" and a Provincial war would at any moment render them liable to a duty so abhorrent to their feelings.

Secondly, the Indians, instigated, it is said, by the authorities at Quebec, held out a continual menace to molest the peace of their habitations, in the event of becoming English subjects.

Thirdly, motives of conscience prevented them from taking an unqualified bond of allegiance; for a clause in the English oath specified liberty of conscience, as far as the laws of England do allow. Now, will the apologists for this disgraceful drama answer, what sort of religious liberty did the laws of England allow to Catholics about the middle of the eighteenth century? Let the history of Ireland answer; or consult the statute books of any of the New England commonwealths. Seven years before the arrival of Cornwallis, an Acadian governor proclaimed that "No Romish

priest shall presume to exercise any of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction within this province." Besides, the Acadians themselves could not forget the intense bigotry of the Puritans, as displayed in the "ravaging" their villages. The revolting butchery of Fr. Rasle; the iconoclastic expedition of Colonel Church; and the sacrilegious violence perpetrated, but a few years before, within the walls of Louisburg, could not have been without a lesson and warning to the Neutrals. It is, therefore, hard to blame them for refusing to take an oath, the proposal of which was an exhibition of perfidy on the part of the government, and the acceptance of which would be a violation of their consciences and an exposure of their lives to serious dangers. Since they absolutely rejected every overture in this direction, and were prepared to accept the consequences, how can they with any propriety be called "rebels"?

In the second place, if Governor Cornwallis was sincere in his accusations of disloyalty, he would naturally have insisted on transmigration, the alternative of refusal to take the oath proposed by himself. But, what did he do? When the French deputies came with their ultimatum, saying, "If your Excellency is not disposed to grant us what we take the liberty of asking (the neutral oath), we are resolved, every one of us, to leave the province," one would think that such a heroic resolve, involving the forfeiture of all their worldly goods, would have given a very easy solution to the question of loyalty. But, instead of granting the ruinous favor of a general exodus, his "Excellency" refused, yet in such a temporizing manner that it is easy to perceive his "instructions" and his opinion of the people were at variance.

To the first deputation the governor replied: We have no objection to your leaving the province; but have you forgotten that this is the spring season? The seeds and grain are not in; go and sow your lands, for till that is done you need expect no favor from this government.

After a few weeks of incessant toil, the spring tillage being as well and faithfully done as if the hapless people hoped to reap the harvest, another deputation came to Halifax, to renew their petition, and Cornwallis again returned a gracious refusal. "We confess," he said, "that your determination to leave gives us pain. We are well aware of your industry and your temperance, and that you are not addicted to any vice or debauchery. This province is your country; you and your fathers have cultivated it; naturally you ought to enjoy the fruits of your labor." Yet their petition was a demand he could not grant; for "we should have to notify all the commanders of his Majesty's ships and troops to allow every one to pass and repass, which would cause the greatest confusion." This certainly is a very flimsy reason. If the Aca-

dians were guilty of the alleged disloyalty, his "Excellency," one would think, had much greater cause to fear "confusion" from their detention.

But there is unquestionable insincerity in Cornwallis's relations with these poor people; when his threats did not intimidate, he cajoled; he spoke like a father, that he might more securely betray; and while praising their virtues and setting forth their rights in Halifax, he was calumniating them in London, and praying for "further instructions." "I am sure they will not leave their habitations this season," he wrote to the Lords of Trade. "My view is to make them as useful as possible to his Majesty while they do stay. If they are still obstinate, I shall receive in the spring his Majesty's further instructions from your Lordship."

The real reasons for refusing the Acadians a free and general departure were, that seventeen thousand people, passing over to Canada, would be too great an accession of strength to the enemy. Thrown penniless upon the barren islands of Prince Edward and Cape Breton, the English feared the Neutrals would become a menace to the tranquillity of the interlopers placed on their lands. Besides, all the English in Nova Scotia, including officials, settlers and soldiers, were largely dependent on the surplus produce of Acadian farms for food; and the British colony turned out to be such a degraded, worthless crew that little or nothing could be expected from them at the time, in their way of cultivating the land.

With direct information from Halifax and "hints" from Massachusetts, there is hardly any doubt that the Lords of Trade were discussing the feasibility of substituting British Protestant subjects in the homes of the obstinate Papists about the time of Cornwallis's appointment as governor. There is clear evidence of a double-faced policy in the documents emanating from Halifax; but not till a few years later do we find an express avowal of the intention to remove the Neutrals. This, however, may be accounted for by the fact that the noble conspirators took every precaution to obliterate all traces of dishonorable motives, and determined to await the logic of events. Haliburton (no friend to the Acadians), who wrote more than fifty years ago, corroborates this view: "In the letter-book of Governor Lawrence," he writes, "which is still extant, no communication to the Board of Trade is entered, from the 24th of December, 1754, to the 5th of August, 1756. The particulars of this affair seem to have been carefully concealed, although it is not easy to assign the reason, unless the parties were, as in truth they might be, ashamed of the transaction." For what reason were all the records, contracts, documents, etc., of the Neutrals forcibly seized and destroyed by order of this Lawrence, the Castle-

reagh of Acadia, unless done in the vain hope to conceal from the world the knowledge of English hypocrisy and cruelty, and thereby to deprive the Acadians of all chance of reversing their sentence before the tribunal of history?

Far from crediting them with any conscientious motives for their course, the authorities affected to believe their obstinacy in refusing to take the prescribed oath, a sufficient proof of treasonable sentiments. Consequently, they were accused of everything in the catalogue of political offences, which may practically be reduced to these: they were in secret league with the enemies of England; they were idle on their lands; and they only awaited the opportunity to revolt.

On the strength of these false accusations, begotten of suspicion and religious rancor, the poor peasants were treated with great harshness. They were made to feel, at every turn, not only that they were a subjugated people, but that they were a despised and hated race. The vexations of petty despotism visited on them would have exasperated the feelings of any other people; yet they bore every galling exaction, in the vain hope that innocence and patient endurance would disarm the enmity of their persecutors.

The only excuse which can be alleged, in extenuation of this unmerited severity, is that a small number of the Acadians, on a few occasions, were taken in arms against the government. Admitting this, history still sustains the assertion that they were, as a "collective body of people," loyal to the crown, so far as the obligations of their oath required.

For, was there ever a community as large as this without some faithless members to any given principle, however sacred? Yet who would think of forming his opinion of a body by the character of the worthless few? It was, then, demanding greater virtue than human nature has ever attained, to expect that no "weak-minded or corruptible individuals" would be found amongst the Neutrals on a point, the morality of which is certainly very debatable. They consisted of a series of villages, some of which were separated from the nearest district by sixty miles of forest land. Moreover, the settlements were subjected to the continual "solicitations" of the French, to whom they were allied by every sacred tie, but whom the exigencies of war compelled to call enemies. The wonder is, not that a few proved recreant, but that, considering old racial and religious animosities, the Neutrals did not throw aside English domination during the long period of the province's defenceless condition. If they did so, when the mother countries were at war, would it have been high treason?

What would the descendants of the Pilgrims have done if Massachusetts Bay had been signed over by treaty to France, and

a small garrison of French soldiers, located in Fort Winthrop, arrogantly maligned and persecuted them? And suppose, as it is most likely, the Frenchmen politely sent back to their own country, or to the bottom of Boston harbor, do you imagine the English monarch would have any great reluctance in bestowing his gracious forgiveness upon the indignant Puritans?

But the character, the principles and public spirit of the New Englanders were totally unlike those of the Acadians. Education and instinct inclined the latter to a child-like submission to authority. They had sworn fidelity to the English monarch, and that pledge, in spite of distrust and cruelty on the one side, and promises and threats on the other, they truly and faithfully observed.

This is shown from the letters of the English officials who, at other times, made the damaging allegations. Mr. Mascarene, Governor of Nova Scotia, wrote to the Duke of Newcastle in 1742: "The frequent rumors we have had of war being declared against France, have not, as yet, made any alteration in the temper of the inhabitants of this province, who appear in a good disposition of keeping their oath of fidelity." This was written after thirty years of English rule.

Two years later England declared war against France. Captain Du Vivier made an unexpected sally from Louisburg, captured the blockhouse at Grand Pré, and carried off the English garrison prisoners. He ordered the people of Minas to acknowledge submission to the King of France, who absolutely refused, assigning as reason: "We live under a mild and tranquil government, and have all good reason to be faithful to it." This was before the introduction of the penal code.

For ten years subsequently a guerilla warfare was carried on between the English and the Canadians aided by the Indians. Nova Scotia was the scene of their skirmishes, and the Neutrals, in consequence, suffered from both sides. Calumniated and oppressed by their governors, they were kept in continual apprehension for their lives by the savages, yet they never swerved from their fidelity to the government.

To say they were ripe for revolt is absolute falsehood. Du Vivier made another attack on Annapolis Royal. There were about eighty men in the fort, which was itself in such a ruinous condition that "cattle passed and repassed at pleasure." Now, if the Acadians were ready to revolt, they could, in the words of the English commander, "muster three or four thousand men." What, then, prevented them from putting an end to British rule, for the time being, at least? Nothing but their respect for the sacred obligations of an oath, and gratitude for past kindness of the

government. Mr. Mascarene, describing this assault of Du Vivier, wrote: "To the breaking of the French measures, the timely succors received from Massachusetts, and our French inhabitants refusing to take up arms against us, we owe our preservation." In 1754 Governor Lawrence expressed it as his opinion "that a very large part of the inhabitants would submit to any terms rather than *take up arms on either side.*"

Whatever shadow of doubt malicious misrepresentation may have thrown over the political rectitude of the Acadians, even their enemies are unanimous in saying they were a most moral, religious, and simple people. The historic descriptions of their guileless character and domestic virtues, impel the reader to the opinion that the beautiful imagery of "Evangeline" is not a flattering mirror of the innocence and simplicity of their lives. Religion was the mainspring of all their actions. The sacred emblem of the cross, the image of the Madonna or of some favorite Saint, met the eye everywhere. The church bell called them to prayer preparatory to the labors of the day, and its welcome sound at evening was again the signal to cease from toil and thank God for the bounties he gave. In this smiling land all were contented and happy; for "the richest were poor, and the poorest lived in abundance." Justly, then, has it been named the Northern Paraguay. "It was," says Haliburton, "a society of brethren, every one of whom was as ready to give as to receive what he considered the common right of mankind." Poverty and illegitimacy were unknown in those settlements. "They formed," writes Bancroft, "but one great family." "Their morals were of unaffected purity." "Thus dwelt together in love," penned Longfellow, "these simple Acadian farmers,—dwelt in the love of God and of man." Are such the material in which dark conspiracy, hypocrisy, and treason are nurtured?

As He did Jacob of old, God blessed their labors and progeny. In less than fifty years they had increased sevenfold. Their goods and effects had grown proportionately. "They computed," says Haliburton, "as many as 60,000 head of horned cattle; most families had several horses, though the tillage was carried on by oxen. Their dwellings, which were of wood, were as comfortable as substantial farmers' houses in Europe.

The district of Minas alone, with a population of 2000, possessed 1269 oxen, 1557 cows, 5000 young cattle, 500 horses, 9000 sheep and 4000 hogs. It had 250 dwelling-houses, 276 barns, 11 mills and one church. And these are the people who, we are informed, were idle and neglected agriculture.

On the other hand, what is the invariable colonial policy of England when dealing with "aliens in race, in language and reli-

gion?" Is it not that the security of the state depends only upon oppression of the people, and when this detestable maxim fails, as fail it ever must, how often have the horrible expedients of banishment or extermination been called into requisition without scruple and without remorse? Even the poor American savage knows this to his cost. In Massachusetts there was a standing offer of £100, and in Nova Scotia £10, for every red man, or his scalp, "by way of bringing the rascals to reason."

It is, therefore, rather amusing to note the perplexity which the Anglo-historians, Hannay, Entick and Haliburton, labor under in trying to assign respectable motives to the wretched governors of Nova Scotia, who lent themselves willing tools to the execution of a prearranged plan to banish the Acadians.

Let us now hear themselves. Feeling how surely the net-work of penal enactments was banishing their rustic tranquillity and happiness, they memorialized Governor Lawrence, in language of great earnestness and dignity:

"It appears, sir," they wrote, "that your Excellency doubts the sincerity with which we have promised to be faithful to his Britannic Majesty. We most humbly beg your Excellency to consider our past conduct. You will see that very far from violating the oath we have taken, we have maintained it in its entirety, in spite of the solicitations and dreadful threats of another power."

This language has the ring of sincerity and candor. Its fearless simplicity is proof that were the subscribers to it conscious of having offended, they would not, thus openly, court investigation into their conduct.

From their sad exile in Pennsylvania the people of Minas addressed a petition to the King of England, setting forth their grievances and sufferings. They complained of the injustice of having been reduced from a happy situation to one of distress and misery without any judicial process or even any accusers appearing against them, but solely on mistaken jealousies and false suspicions that they were inclined to take part with his Majesty's enemies. "We desire," they continued, "to be permitted to answer our accusers in a judicial way. In the meantime, sir, permit us here solemnly to declare that these accusations are utterly false and groundless, as far as they concern us as a collective body of people. It was always our fixed resolution to maintain to the utmost of our power the oath of fidelity we had taken." Are they not as worthy of credibility as their enemies?

The real motives that actuated the English in a policy which culminated in despotism were to get possession of the fertile fields and comfortable homes of the Acadian farmers and to give them to English emigrants. The Anglo-historians, however, maintain

the contrary. "A more flagrant untruth," says Hannay, "was never told than to say that the Acadians were expelled because the greedy English colonists looked upon their fair farms with covetous eyes." It is not easy to reconcile this assertion with the following correspondence.

In 1754 Governor Lawrence wrote to the Lords of Trade: "As they possess the best and largest tracts of land in the Province, it cannot be settled (by the English) while they remain. . . . I cannot help thinking that it would be much better they were away." To which the Lords replied: "As Mr. Shirley (Governor of Massachusetts) has hinted, in a letter to the Earl of Halifax, that there is probability of getting considerable numbers of New England people to settle, consult him upon it . . . but the idea of an English settlement seems to us absurd, but upon supposition that the French forts, Beau-Sejour, Baie Verte, etc., are destroyed and the French driven out." When the last act of the horrible tragedy was drawing to a close Lawrence confessed that "as soon as the French were gone he would do his best to encourage people to come from the continent to settle their lands, and thus strike off the great expense of victualling the troops. This," he continued, "is one of the happy effects I proposed to myself from driving the French off the Isthmus."

Here is clear proof that at least a year before their expatriation the authorities in London, Halifax and Boston were deliberating in cold blood how they could accomplish the expulsion of the Acadians, with the express purpose of giving their lands to English settlers and of increasing the coffers of the royal exchequer.

A favorable opportunity to "dislodge the French from their entrenchments" was all that was wanted in order to put into execution this iniquitous purpose, and such occurred in the memorable year 1755. Before the first of July Beau-Sejour, Baie Verte and St. John, a line of forts assertive of French dominion over the territory between the St. Croix and St. Lawrence rivers, had fallen into the hands of the New England general, Colonel Moncton. The expedition was authorized by New England, and paid for with English gold. The men were mustered in Massachusetts, and were commanded by their own officers. The victorious arms of the Puritans had now added a vast country to British possessions. Then "the English were masters of the sea, were undisputed lords of the country, and could exercise clemency without apprehension," writes Bancroft. The Acadians were completely defenceless, having given up their guns and boats, and "cowered before their masters, expecting forbearance."

Yet on pretence of fear—and oh! when tyrants can do what they please they fear everything; on pretence of insecurity arising

from imaginary enemies and dangers, the High Mighty Council of Halifax met, and, "after mature deliberation, unanimously agreed" that, as the Chief Justice had pronounced the Neutrals "confirmed rebels," they had now "collectively and without exception" become "Popish recusants." Their presence in the land could be tolerated no longer, "for, after the departure of the fleet and troops, the province would not be in a condition to drive them out," and "such a juncture as the present might never occur."

Though the verdict had been pronounced that they must be uprooted from the soil on which their children were born, and in which six generations of their ancestors were buried, yet they could not be permitted to go where inclination prompted; for, like the shepherds of Mantua, the memory of their "fruitful fields and still more fruitful flocks" may exasperate the feelings of the poverty-stricken exiles, and impel them to return in wrath to avenge their wrongs upon the intruders. State necessity demanded (and the plague take such state policy) that "all" should be taken by force and scattered among the English provinces, from "New Hampshire to Georgia."

If condign punishment had been inflicted on the few irresponsible men who were taken in arms against the English, history could not raise the voice of complaint, but no civilized government can defend, and no principle of justice sanctions, the verdict of the Halifax Council, which involved the robbery and extermination of a whole people for the misconduct of a few, without trial by any of the forms of judicature, or without any specific accusation of treason. Nay, more; during the whole course of English rule in Acadia not a single individual was ever brought to trial for treasonable acts or words, and this, together with the arguments we have adduced in favor of the character and fidelity of the Acadians, leads us to the conclusion that their ruin was based upon the false and malicious accusations of official hypocrites, who, with eyes ever turned obsequiously to the Throne, would trample upon all the laws of justice and humanity for "one smile of favor."

Even the barbarous manner in which the sentence was executed would preclude belief in the probability of honest reasons to justify it. When the condemnation was pronounced, not a shadow of suspicion crossed the minds of the victims, and not a whisper gave any intelligence of the determination of the captors. Profound secrecy was the order. The homes of the Acadian farmers were, as usual, the abodes of mirth, gayety, and happiness, and their harvest fields still rang with the merry sounds of cheerful labor. The hunters waited till the last sheaf was stored into "bursting granaries," and then a mysterious order was sent to the various settlements commanding the male population of each to assemble at a certain hour on the same day.

The men and boys who dwelt by the Basin of Minas assembled in the church at the appointed time, 3 o'clock in the afternoon of Friday, September 5th, 1755. As soon as they were all in, the house of prayer was turned into a prison, the diabolical sentence was read, and scarcely had their sounds of anguish subsided when the blaze of their homes and all their worldly wealth threw its weird light upon the windows of the chapel. What torture these affectionate peasants must have suffered while thinking of their wives and children, their aged and infirm parents, thus exposed, without the help of their natural protectors, to the flames and to the brutality of an English soldiery.

All the men of Grand Pré were successfully decoyed, for they had no suspicion of the purport of the summons. They left home but for a few hours, and, alas! they never saw those homes again. Similar artifice and cruelty were practised in the other settlements, but only with partial success; for, the secret getting abroad, the inhabitants took the alarm and fled for protection to the woods and to the "wigwams of the savages." In a few weeks that peaceful country, blooming like a garden, was turned into a solitude. Seventeen thousand people, like Job, "simple, upright, fearing God and avoiding evil," were violently torn penniless from their native land. Seven thousand of them were cast upon the shores of North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Philadelphia, New York, Connecticut, and Boston, among strangers who abhorred them, both on account of their religion and their nationality. Of the rest, some settled on the banks of the St. John; three thousand in the region of Miramichi; some escaped to Quebec; many died of starvation in the forests, or perished in the deep snow on their way to Canada; some were shot down in the act of escaping, and at Grand Pré those who got beyond the reach of the rifle soon returned, for "military execution would be immediately visited on the next of kin" by order of Colonel Winslow.

When fire, sword, and brutality had seemed to have committed their worst horrors, there was yet another torture in reserve for the poor victims, fiendish in its nature. Whole families were separated, never, in many instances, to meet in this world. To those who dwelt so lovingly together this must have been the cause of greatest pain and anguish. "Wives were torn from their husbands, and mothers, when it was too late, saw their children left on the land, extending their hands with wildest entreaties;" and this, too, after Colonel Winslow had promised "that whole families should embark together." Behold the work of Christian civilized man! Done to whom? and for what? To brothers differing only in language and religion, and for a crime which, like Macbeth's dagger, was chiefly a creation of the mind.

Like Sheridan's imaginary stranger, while contemplating the devastation and horrors of the scene we may ask, was it war, civil dissension, disputed succession, or some affliction of Providence that laid waste this beautiful and opulent country? Oh, no! "All this has been accomplished by the friendship, generosity, and kindness of the English nation." And we regret to say, it was carried out by the liberty-loving sons of Massachusetts, whose ancestors had not dreamed of Plymouth Rock when the pioneer Acadians had made a permanent home by the banks of the Annapolis.

When the Acadians seemed to be completely extirpated, the Lords of Trade congratulated the king that "the zealous endeavors of Governor Lawrence were crowned with an entire success."

"I know not," wrote Bancroft, "if the annals of the human race keep the record of sorrows so wantonly inflicted, so bitter, and so perennial, as fell upon the French inhabitants of Acadia."

"We have been true," said they of themselves, "to our religion and to ourselves; yet nature appears to consider us only as objects of public vengeance."

"Tradition is fresh and positive," wrote Haliburton, "in the various parts of the United States where they were located, respecting their guileless, peaceable, and scrupulous character; and their descendants still deserve the name of a mild, frugal, and pious people."

Scientific Chronicle.

NATURAL GAS.

THIS great source of wealth, which is at present drawing towards our country the envious eyes of foreign manufacturers and economists, has been extensively developed only within the last few years. Its existence, however, has been known, both in the United States and in other countries, for quite a long period of time. "Burning springs," like that on the Canadian shore of Niagara Falls, are of no rare occurrence in Europe and Asia. It is said, moreover, that the Chinese have used natural gas for manufacturing purposes, conveying it through bamboo pipes to suitable furnaces. In our own country several sources of inflammable gas were known in the early part of this century. The gas now used for lighting the town of Fredonia, N. Y., was discovered in 1821; two years later, when Lafayette passed through the place, an illumination by means of natural gas was one of the grand features of his reception. In several other places gas was known to issue from the ground, but it was generally regarded as a nuisance and a danger rather than a benefit, and was rarely utilized. Its application to industry on a large scale can be said to date only from the year 1882. From that time its development has been wonderful; so that now, in the city of Pittsburgh alone, it replaces more than 10,000 tons of coal per day. In addition to the advantage of its cheapness as a fuel, it gives to Pittsburgh an improved quality of manufactured products and the blessing of a much clearer atmosphere, comparatively free from the smoke which formerly darkened the city.

Within the past three or four years many articles have been published which have discussed this new and valuable fuel, both from a scientific and from a practical point of view. Among the latest contributions to the subject we find a lecture delivered at the Franklin Institute on December 18th by Mr. Chas. A. Ashburner, Geologist in charge of the Pennsylvania State Survey. A few words on so important a subject may not prove uninteresting to our readers. And in order to keep our remarks within modest limits, we shall omit all financial statistics, and content ourselves with answering the following questions: (1) How is natural gas obtained? (2) What are its uses? (3) What is its probable duration, and what is its origin?

(1) *Sources of the gas.* The regions in which natural gas is found are, for the most part, those which yield petroleum and coal. The gas-belt now developed extends from New York State through Pennsylvania to West Virginia, and gas has also been found in Ohio, Kentucky, Illinois, and Kansas. As far as we can judge from geological evidence, it may hereafter be discovered as far west as the Rocky Mountains, though perhaps at great depths; while east of the Alleghanies it is probably not near enough to the surface to be reached by boring.

Sometimes the gas makes known its presence by escaping in small

quantities from crevices in the rocks, or by bubbling up through springs of water, but oftener it has been accidentally met with while sinking oil-wells. Hence those who search for gas usually confine themselves to the oil-producing regions. The selection, however, of the exact spot for a gas-well is still a matter of discussion. Some geologists hold that gas, because of its lightness, should be looked for on the *anticlinals*, that is, along the crests of the undulations of the earth's strata, or, what is the same thing, in those places *from* which the strata dip in opposite directions. Others maintain that wells should be sunk on the *synclinals*, where the strata dip *towards* each other. As a matter of fact, it has been found in both positions, as well as in *monoclinals*, or strata slanting in but one direction. It often happens that practical drillers, casting aside all theories, select the spot in which their machinery can be most easily erected, and meet with a good supply of gas. The machinery somewhat resembles that used for drilling artesian wells, and is very similar to the arrangement by which oil-wells are bored. A hole about six inches in diameter is drilled through the soil and rock until gas is reached, or until the experimenter gives up in despair and tries another spot. As the drill sinks into the earth, it can be lengthened by fastening section after section to the upper part. If the well passes through soft soil, an iron tube is often fitted in to prevent the earth from filling the bore. The depth at which gas is found varies in different places; the wells around Pittsburgh have a depth of from 1300 to 1500 feet. When the drill reaches the gas, no doubt is left as to the fact, for the great pressure usually sends the instrument flying out into the air. Sometimes the rush of gas is enough to force out the iron tube with which the bore is lined. Thus, in the spring of 1881, while some workmen were searching for oil at Clarendon, Pa., they struck a vein of gas having at first a pressure of 500 pounds to the square inch. The drill was blown out with such violence that several of the men had a narrow escape from death. Again in April, 1882, in Washington Co., Pa., the Niagara Oil Company, after boring to a depth of 2200 feet in search of oil, reached such a powerful gas vein that the tools, weighing more than 800 pounds, were thrown to a great distance. The continuance of work was for some time utterly impossible, because the noise of escaping gas was great enough to render the sound of the human voice inaudible for a distance of 300 feet from the well. The pressure of the gas, as it comes from the well, is usually from 100 to 325 pounds to the square inch. When the first rush of gas is over, the pressure, and consequently the amount of gas given off, begins to decrease. The well sunk at Tiffin, Ohio, in February, 1886, gave at first 600,000 cubic feet a day; but the supply afterwards fell to the comparatively modest amount of 100,000 cubic feet.

Natural gas is a mixture of several different compounds. The most abundant are usually hydrocarbons of the marsh gas series, together with carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide; free hydrogen and nitrogen are also present. The gas, as it comes from the well, forms an excellent fuel; but, except in a few localities, it has very little illumi-

nating power. It must therefore, in most cases, be purified and mixed with some less volatile hydrocarbons before it can be used as a source of light.

(2) *Uses of the gas.* In order to answer the second question, how the gas is utilized, let us take a glance at the district in which most of it is consumed,—the immediate vicinity of Pittsburgh. The gas is supplied to that city by six companies, owning more than 100 wells. Most of these wells are situated to the east of the city, at Tarentum and Murrys-ville. Into the mouth of the well is fitted a strong tube, to convey the gas to a large iron reservoir destined to collect whatever oil and water may be brought up with the gas. The quantity of these impurities is always small, and sometimes almost nothing. To carry the gas to the consumers, there are more than 500 miles of pipe, varying from four to sixteen inches in diameter, about half the length of pipe being under ground in the city itself. The total estimated capacity of all these lines is about 250,000,000 cubic feet per day. The largest company supplies about 400 factories, and nearly twenty times as many dwellings. Near the junction of the pipe and the reservoir is an immense safety-valve, which allows some of the gas to escape into the atmosphere when the tension becomes too great, and thus prevents the bursting of the pipes from excessive pressure. Similar safety-valves are placed at intervals along the line of pipe leading to the city. On account of the friction of the gas in the pipes, the pressure gradually becomes less, as the distance from the reservoir increases. But, since the maximum pressure, allowed by law within the city, is fifteen pounds to the square inch, the companies place at the entrance of the city pressure regulators, which allow the surplus gas to escape through high columns. The gas issuing from the top of each column is lighted, both to avoid the danger of an explosion and to prevent the noise of the escaping fluid.

A few years ago, the danger of a sudden failure of the gas supply was a serious drawback to its use. This danger is now almost entirely obviated by having pressure gauges here and there throughout the city. There is telephone communication between the stations at which the gauges are placed ; so that, if the supply of gas fails in one part of the city, an additional quantity can be turned in from the other sections. Where the pipe enters a factory or a dwelling-house, there is a very ingenious pressure-regulator, which closes automatically if the supply be wanting, and thus saves the consumer from the danger of an explosion. The danger would arise in the following manner : If the gas be turned off at the central station, while a jet is burning in some dwelling-house, the jet will, of course, be extinguished, but the aperture will remain open. When the gas is afterwards turned on at the station, it will flow through the pipes, and issue from the open orifice of the burner, forming with the air an extremely explosive mixture. There is, however, some danger at the wells. Thus, at Murrys-ville, on April 19th, 1886, some escaping gas was accidentally ignited, and the fire was communicated to the McWilliams well. The flame shot up to a height of 70 feet, the heat was intense, and it was feared that all the wells in the vicinity

would take fire. The flames were not extinguished until the 22d of April, after millions of cubic feet of gas had been lost, and a great quantity of property destroyed.

But, as a general rule, the natural gas is not more dangerous than either oil or manufactured gas, while the advantages attending its use are very great. Where it is used for fuel, coal-dust and ashes are, of course, absent; moreover, the gas is always at hand, since the mere turning of a stop-cock supplies it ready for use. For glass factories and iron furnaces it is invaluable, since the manufactured products are of a better quality than those obtained when the fuel is coal. For steam boilers it is admirably well suited, for it heats the furnace equally, thus avoiding unequal expansion, and causing the boiler to last much longer. These advantages have led many to the opinion that, were the supply of natural gas to fail, it would be advisable to make a cheap gas, to be used as fuel, in order to obtain manufactured products equal to those now produced. So great, indeed, is the advantage in using gas, that a company of British capitalists has been recently formed, for the purpose of sinking gas-wells in the English coal-producing regions. It is to be hoped that their efforts may meet with success.

(3) *The probable duration of the gas, and its origin.* But, is it true that the supply will fail? Mr. Ashburner, in his last lecture, takes a very hopeful view of this subject. He admits that it must become exhausted, but asserts that the time at which this will happen is yet far distant. Other geologists, however, of no less ability than he, are far less sanguine. Professor S. P. Lesley says: "I take this opportunity to express my opinion, in the strongest terms, that the amazing exhibition of oil and gas which has characterized the last twenty years, and will probably characterize the next ten or twenty, is, nevertheless, a temporary and vanishing phenomenon, one which young men will live to see come to its natural end." He ends by regretting, and many scientists and manufacturers regret with him, the wasteful use that has been made of both products, especially of gas. We may say of this reckless consumption what has been said of the destruction of timber—the mistake will be seen when it is too late to repair it. Some, however, hope that before the supply of natural gas becomes exhausted, artificial gas will be cheap enough to supply its place; and others are looking forward to wonderful developments in the application of electricity to practical life.

Although the manner in which the gas is formed is not yet completely ascertained, still its origin is not altogether unknown. Gas and oil both result from the slow decomposition of vegetable matter, which has by some means been buried in the earth. We have already mentioned that both are usually found in the same regions; moreover, the strata through which gas-wells are sunk closely resemble those of the Carboniferous and Devonian series, which are pierced by oil-wells. It is certain, however, that the gas is not formed in the sand or porous rock in which it is ordinarily found; they are only reservoirs,—huge natural tanks to hold the gas. Where, then, can it be formed? Most probably in the beds of coal. For when vegetable matter has been covered by

many successive layers, or strata, of earth, decomposition takes place. Most of the carbon which was in the wood is left behind as coal. The rest of the carbon, together with the hydrogen, oxygen, and whatever other elements may be present, unite to form new compounds, some of which are liquid, while others are gaseous. The liquid product, the oil, can easily pass through the porous strata of the earth, and collect in the depressions, or hollows, of the more solid strata. The gas, of course, moves far more freely than the oil, and consequently may be found at a greater distance from the coal-bed. If the gas can escape into the atmosphere through any opening, it will do so. Sometimes it can reach the air only by forcing its way up through a spring of water, forming a "burning spring." When, however, it is hemmed in by strata which it cannot penetrate, it collects in great quantities, and acquires a high tension. If now an opening be made, in other words, if a well be sunk, the gas escapes with great force. It is true that the decomposition of vegetable matter is still going on, and gas is continually produced, but by no means rapidly enough to supply what is used. In connection with this, Professor Lesley says: "I am not a geologist, if it be true that the manufacture of oil in the laboratory of nature is still going on at the hundredth or the thousandth part of the rate of exhaustion;" and he adds: "I hold the same opinion for the gas, with the difference that for it the end will certainly come sooner."

Before we leave the subject, let us say a few words about the conflicting opinions with regard to the best spot for seeking gas. It is asserted by some that wells should never be drilled except on *anticlinals*, where the strata, sloping in opposite directions, can act like a gas-holder. This assertion, however, is too broad. It is scarcely true to say that gas can never be obtained on a *synclinal*, for sometimes it *has* been found in that position. Let us suppose that there is neither water nor oil in the stratum in which the gas accumulates; in this case the gas will acquire a certain tension throughout the entire stratum, and wherever a well is drilled, on *anticlinal*, *synclinal*, or *monoclinical* gas will issue. But what will happen if a certain amount of oil or water be present? The liquid, being heavier than the gas, will settle in the *synclinals*, while the gas will accumulate in the *anticlinals*; in this latter case a well sunk on an *anticlinal* will be a gas-well, while one drilled on a *synclinal* will yield either oil or water.

It is scarcely necessary to add that the undulations of the earth's surface by no means coincide with the bendings of the strata. Consequently it is often a difficult task to determine the direction in which the lower strata are inclined, and the choice of a good position for a gas-well is yet open to discussion.

THE RIVIERA EARTHQUAKE OF FEBRUARY 23D.

RECENT events would seem to indicate that we are now in an epoch of great seismic disturbance. Districts where earthquakes have hitherto been unknown are now affected. The number of such disturbances

lately reported by scientific papers is, indeed, wonderful, and never before were the accounts of shocks occurring at sea so numerous. Our own country, too, has come in for its share. In addition to the disastrous Charleston earthquake of last August, we may mention the late one of February 6th in Indiana, of which complete official reports are soon to be published. Of the former we have already spoken; the latter, though of a milder character, embraced an area of 35,000 square miles. As in the case of the first mentioned, the area was elliptical, the major axis extending from east to west.

The shocks felt on February 23d, at 6 A.M., in Italy and Southern France, were in many ways remarkable. The centre of the disturbance proved to be in the Italian province of "Porto Maurizio," adjoining the French Department of the "Alpes Maritimes." The greatest loss of life occurred near Oreglia, where—to say nothing of the many who were injured—over five hundred persons perished, while Bajardo, with two adjoining villages, was almost entirely destroyed. There were further losses of life in the province of Genoa and in the Department of the Alpes Maritimes. Of the two shocks at Toulon the first lasted fifteen seconds, the second twelve. Shocks were felt also in many parts of Southeastern France and Switzerland, in the Italian provinces, near Genoa, and in Corsica. On Mount Vesuvius the seismic instruments gave no indication whatsoever of the disturbance, while, on the other hand, those of Mount Etna and of Catania were greatly agitated, and about one hour and a half later the seismoscope at Washington, D. C., was also disturbed. Since that time up to the present writing (March 6th) milder shocks have from time to time been reported from places included in the above-mentioned districts, and from Calabria.

We come now to mention some peculiar phenomena which give this earthquake a distinctive character of its own. On February 26th, at the very moment of the most violent shock, there was at Cannes and Antibes a sudden sinking of the sea level by about three feet, followed immediately afterwards by a rise of six feet. This fact, coupled with the report that the steamer Guadaloupe, while at a short distance from the western shore of Corsica, experienced two distinct shocks, would indicate that the earthquake extended under the waters of the Mediterranean; there are even certain data which would lead us to fix its starting point at quite a distance from the Italian shore. The earthquake seems to have pursued its track in a direction running from northwest, which will account for the fact that Vesuvius and the country about Naples remained unaffected, while Etna was greatly disturbed.

It is worthy of notice that this earthquake affected a region parallel to the large *fault*, or line of weakness, which extends along the southeastern side of the Apennines, and which not unfrequently is subjected to violent shocks. On the present occasion, however, this line of weakness seems to have escaped in great part the earthquake's course, having touched upon it only near the Lipari Islands, and in the neighborhood of Catania and Reggio. As to the exact origin of the disturbance no answer can as yet be given. In all probability it is due to increased

interior pressure coincident with the high tide caused by the new moon, rather than to volcanic action. Under this latter hypothesis it would be difficult to explain the apparent inactivity of Mount Vesuvius.

TRANSMISSION OF POWER TO A DISTANCE BY ELECTRICITY.

FOR many years practical scientists have been seeking a means by which power might be transmitted to a distance without great diminution. The reasons for such efforts are evident. There are many waterfalls in places where they cannot be utilized conveniently, and great energy, stored in swiftly running rivers, goes to waste because it cannot be made use of at a distance. Besides, the running of large steam-engines costs in proportion much less than smaller ones, which often burn five or even ten times as much fuel per horse-power. Other expenses are also diminished in proportion in large central stations; they can be located where coal can easily be transported and water readily had. Moreover, the skilful attendance required to use steam safely is by far cheaper, one engineer being required for the whole station. For these and similar reasons the question has been often raised as to how power could be transmitted to a distance and how it could be divided according to the needs of consumers, especially when they use it only at intervals.

Many solutions of the problem have been suggested; some have been tried and found wanting; others, succeeding under certain conditions, have failed when these conditions were not verified. In Hull, England, and in a few other places, power is transmitted by a hydraulic system from a central station. In other places transmission by compressed air has been tried to advantage in working quarries and in sinking bridge-piers. In mining and in making tunnels it has been found very successful, while the air, released from the compression-pipe into the driving-engine, on being set free, produces a draft which purifies the atmosphere of the shaft and so serves a double purpose. To such an arrangement is due, in great part, the successful boring of the Mt. Cenis and St. Gothard tunnels.

In Birmingham, England, trial is about to be made of this last system, though on a much larger scale and with the most skilfully devised arrangements. A large central station is to be furnished with steam-engines of the most improved pattern, for compressing air in pipes several miles long and covering an area of nearly two square miles. The general pressure will be of three atmospheres, but at the places where the compressed air is to be employed the pressure may be reduced at will by means of an ingenious contrivance which at the same time will serve to measure the amount of air employed. The results of this new enterprise will be watched with considerable interest, and, should they prove satisfactory, the system will doubtless be largely adopted in the industrial world.

From what has already been said it may readily be surmised that the transmission of power by electricity is a consideration of paramount importance. That power may be thus transmitted even to great distances, has, after much active study, been proved a most gratifying possibility; but financial considerations have thus far left reason to doubt whether this mode of transmission will ever be universally employed. Some years ago, Sir William Thomson suggested that the millions of horse-power now wasted at Niagara might be partially transferred by electricity to New York City and be used during the day as motive power and at night for illuminating purposes.

It is scarcely probable that this suggestion will ever be acted upon. Apart from the fact that such an undertaking would mar the beauty of this unique cataract, the expense it would entail renders it impracticable. But that which probably never will be done with Niagara may prove practicable in the case of minor falls and rapids.

Again, might it not be possible to work the immense plant now to be found in all our large cities, not merely during the night for electric lighting, but during the entire twenty-four hours? For during the ordinary working hours the power generated by large engines might, by the current of the dynamos, be distributed to the neighboring mills and factories. At all events the problem, while as yet unsolved from a financial view (with which we are not at present concerning ourselves), is, from a scientific point of view, already satisfactorily solved, especially after the remarkable experiments of MM. Deprez and Fontaine in France. Before describing their experiments it will be well to call to mind the history of this new application of electricity, and the principles involved in it. It is difficult to say who first suggested the employment of electricity for utilizing distant power, but the first experiment in this line was made at the Vienna Exposition in 1873. Ever since the experiments have been repeated in all Expositions, especially in exhibits of electrical apparatus, and most commonly in connection with Gramme's dynamos. Thus, in the Centennial Exposition, Philadelphia, 1876, the Gramme Company showed a transmission of two or three horse-power, traversing a wire with a resistance of twenty ohms, that is, a resistance as great as would be offered by a copper wire one-fourth of an inch in diameter and sixteen miles long. In 1878 the same company again performed this experiment and others of a similar character.

In 1879, near Paris, the first practical application of the method was made by MM. Chretien and Felix, who, with the aid of electricity, ploughed a large field. In this work they employed a current of twenty amperes and two hundred volts. From that date the industrial application rapidly spread, and at the Paris Electrical Exposition, 1881, as many as fifty Gramme machines were employed in transmitting power. The difficulty of transmission increases with the distance, or, to speak more accurately, with the resistance offered by the line connecting the generator and receivers. The principle involved in this electrical transmission of power may be deduced from the following remarks: The Gramme, Siemens, and other dynamos of similar type, are true electrical

motors, consisting essentially of a coil or bobbin of wire. When this coil is turned, by mechanical force, in the field of a powerful electro-magnet, a very rapid succession of instantaneous currents is produced. An ordinary "one-light" Gramme dynamo, making 800 revolutions per minute, will in that space of time give over 200,000 such currents. This rapid succession makes the current of the dynamo entirely similar to that produced by a strong battery. But to cause this rapid revolution of the armature a very great force is required; for while the induction currents are produced, the electro-dynamical repulsion (developed, according to Lenz's well-known law, between the currents of the armature and the amperian currents of the field) is to be overcome. Now, if a current is allowed to pass into the same armature at rest, this repulsion causes the armature to revolve in a direction opposite to that which it had previously, and a belt stretched upon the driving-wheel can be used to move any machinery. So that one dynamo near the source of power—say a waterfall—can be made to develop an electric current which, carried by a wire to another dynamo where the power is to be utilized, is all that is required for the transmission. But in all cases, especially where the power is carried to a considerable distance, part of the current is lost. Even in the most successful experiments this has been verified: for instance, in those made by MM. Deprez and Fontaine only one-half of the primitive power was reproduced.

Through the munificence of the Rothschilds, who are said to have given no less than 800,000 francs, M. Marcel Deprez was enabled, a few months ago, to experiment with apparatus of his own devising between Paris and Creil, a distance of about thirty-five miles. From eighty horse-power, generated by a steam engine in Paris, he succeeded in transmitting over a single wire forty horse-power to Creil, and this without overheating the wire. The experiment was made in the presence of scientists and other interested persons. In a paper read by him before the French Academy of Sciences, he proposed to submit his process to further tests in the presence of a committee; this was done, and the committee gave the following official statement of the results: With one generator and one receiver, fifty per cent. of the original force was reproduced with a current of 10 ampères; the machines worked regularly and continuously; the maximum electromotive force was a little over 6000 volts; no accident had occurred during six months, and there was no apparent danger even in using uncovered wires supported on poles. The same committee estimated that the probable cost of the plant for transmitting fifty-horse power round a circular line of seventy miles would be about \$25,000, though the outlay would probably be diminished if the machines were frequently constructed.

The experiments of M. Hyppolite Fontaine, with the concurrence of several other gentlemen, were made with the utmost care and skill, to show that "the machines constructed by M. Gramme are lighter, cheaper, and better from every point of view, than those recently experimented with on the Railway of the North," in France, by M. Deprez. The experiment was made, not by actually transmitting power

from a distance—a method too expensive without the munificent aid of another Rothschild—but in the office of the Gramme Co., by allowing the current to pass through a resistance of 100 ohms, which is about the resistance to be overcome in a copper wire one-fourth of an inch in diameter and eighty miles long. The machines employed were of a unique type, called “Superior,” four being used as generators and three as receivers, each giving, at the normal speed of 1400 revolutions per minute, an electromotive force of 1600 volts and a current of 10 ampères. The power transmitted under these circumstances is stated to be greater than that produced by Deprez, reaching about fifty-two per cent. of the primitive power.

ELECTROMOTORS.

SOON after its first discovery, some forty years ago, electro-magnetism was utilized for producing motion by electricity, but the first electro-motors were mere toys compared with those of the present day. Progress in this line was at first gradual; in fact, it was not until twenty years ago, in the workshops of Mr. Froment, of Paris, that an electro-motive engine of one horse-power could be seen running in a satisfactory manner. Since the invention of dynamos, however, rapid advancement has been made. We need not insist on the principle underlying their use, as we have mentioned it in the preceding pages, when speaking of the receivers used in the transmission of power. We shall confine ourselves to an enumeration of some of the applications that have been or might be made of them. To begin with the most recent that has come to our knowledge: On Eighth Avenue, New York City, cars can be seen running without horses or steam. They are propelled by a Siemens dynamo, through which a current, obtained from storage batteries placed under the seat of the car, is allowed to pass. To stop the car, the current is broken and the brakes applied. This system, which is said to work satisfactorily, is on trial, having been introduced into this country last fall by Mr. Edmond Julien, the inventor, who met with considerable success in its application throughout continental Europe, especially in Belgium. The accumulators are charged in the car-stables, and are able to run the cars for seven hours without recharging. This is only a more perfect application of the system that was tried in Paris, several years ago, when large omnibuses carrying thirty persons were driven by electricity. The same kind of motor, with a current not stored in accumulators but produced by a dynamo, is employed on several electrical railroads in Germany, England, France, and also in this country, as, for instance, on the road outside of Baltimore. Stationary engines are placed at the end of the line to work the dynamos. The current is allowed to pass, either by the two rails of the tracks, or, with greater safety and smaller loss of electricity, by a conductor placed on poles along the line—the track serving as return wire. When the current passes through a Siemens

dynamo, or Daft motor—the kind used in Baltimore, and tried on the elevated railroad in New York—it propels the car or train.

Both these systems are certainly practical and successful ; and when all the technical difficulties shall have been overcome, they will, no doubt, be rapidly developed. Even now the Van Depoele street railways are in use in Minneapolis, Montgomery, Detroit, Scranton, Toronto and other places on this continent. Last fall electricity was used to propel a boat across the English Channel, and it has been used for moving balloons, in which latter case the current is obtained either from accumulators, or from ordinary batteries. As regards balloons, the electromotors would seem to be very safe and serviceable. Their weight remains constant, and there is no danger of fire, which is always imminent when steam engines are carried in the basket.

Besides, these motors will prove invaluable where, as in the case of submarine torpedo boats, the products of combustion or escaping steam are apt to be injurious. It is true, in such boats compressed air, which would also serve to replace that vitiated by the occupants, could be used, but the power furnished by it would be inadequate. The great power often required for submarine navigation can be supplied only by electricity, which might also be utilized for firing the torpedos. Another instance where foul air is a hindrance is in long tunnels. All remember how, a few months ago, the hands of a freight train in Mount Cenis tunnel were rendered unconscious by the gases escaping from the locomotive, and were revived with difficulty. In the St. Gothard tunnel also, not long after its opening, two men, who were on an engine helping to propel the train from the rear, were asphyxiated by the products of combustion of the engine in front. To avoid such dangers traction cables might be used ; but electrical motors have been proposed, as they were proposed also for propelling trains through the tunnel under the English Channel. This tunnel, including the approaches, is the longest gallery as yet tried or projected. The work on it has been stopped, but considering the great advantages to be derived from it, it must be carried into effect sooner or later, notwithstanding England's apprehensions of being attacked by France. In this connection, an idea was suggested which, though very ingenious from a theoretical point of view, is, perhaps, practically too difficult and complicated. It was thought, that, instead of using brakes on the down-grade of the approach tunnels, the motion of the train might be moderated by causing it to revolve dynamos, which would increase the charge of storage batteries placed in the cars. The energy thus stored would afterwards move the same dynamos, and help to propel the train on the level part of the tunnel, or serve for illuminating purposes.

This idea is capable of extension on ordinary roads. In the present system, the brakes are applied on arriving at stations to destroy the momentum of the train. This is a dead loss of force not only without compensation, but with injury to the cars and the rails. If, instead of the brakes, dynamos were used in the manner just mentioned, these inconveniences would be avoided, and the energy of the momentum stored for future use.

BOOK NOTICES.

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE UNITED STATES, FROM THE FIRST ATTEMPTED COLONIZATION TO THE PRESENT TIME, WITH PORTRAITS, VIEWS, MAPS, AND FAC-SIMILES. By *John Gilmary Shea*. Vol. I.: The Catholic Church in Colonial Days, the Thirteen Colonies—the Ottawa and Illinois Country—Louisiana—Florida—Texas—New Mexico and Arizona, 1521–1763. 8vo. Illustrated. 663 pages. New York: John G. Shea, 1886.

The volume before us is the first of a series which, when completed, will have a value which can scarcely be over-estimated. The Church in the United States has attained dimensions which exceed those of the Church in any other English-speaking country. It is full, too, of signs of continuing future vigor and growth, which will soon give it an influence and power equal to, or greater than, that of the Church in any other country on the face of the earth. Its special office also, is to lead and guide the people of the United States, who, great and powerful as they are, are yet only in the beginning of their greatness, safely through the dangers which imperil their future growth and expansion, and their entrance upon what, evidently, is the commencement of a new era in the world's history.

To trace, therefore, the process by which the Church in the United States has attained its present strength and vigor, to fully and faithfully narrate her history, is a most important work.

At the same time it is a work of extreme difficulty. The difficulty is threefold: First, It is a work of vast extent, comprehending as it does the greater part of North America in which Christianity has any existence, reaching from the Bay of Fundy to the Rio Grande River, and from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific.

Secondly, It is a most intricate work. For the history of the Catholic Church in the regions which the United States now comprise is intimately connected with the histories of Spain, France, England, Ireland, and Germany, and with their histories at periods when they were most active in schemes of conquest and colonization and commercial enterprise, most jealous of each other, and hostile, and at the same time were, socially and politically, most interiorly disturbed and confused.

Thus the history of the Church in the United States is inseparably interwoven with movements and occurrences and questions, national and international, of European nations; social, political, commercial, and religious questions; with their diplomacy, their mutual jealousies, their alliances, and their wars.

In the third place, the work requires an acquaintance with, and careful study of, multitudinous documents, reports, and letters, not only official, but also personal, many of which are scattered about, hidden away, or lost sight of, in Spain, in Portugal, in France, in England, in Canada and Mexico, in California, and in various other parts of our country—documents and letters written in half a dozen different languages.

All this makes the task of composing a history of the Catholic Church in the United States exceptionally difficult, and one which requires for its successful completion a combination of special qualifications which very few persons possess. But just these qualifications Dr. John Gilmary Shea does eminently possess. His early studies and pursuits made him a master of the French, Spanish, Italian, and other modern languages, and also of a number of those of ancient times. The intellectual and

moral training he received from Fathers of the Society of Jesus as a novice, developed his natural perseverance, intellectual industry, keenness of perception, carefulness in discrimination, in sifting and disentangling confused statements, comparing and weighing contradictory testimony and arriving at his conclusions. His natural tastes inclined him to devote himself to the study of history as a special pursuit, and particularly to the history of the discovery, exploration, colonization, and evangelization of North America. The various works he has published on these subjects would almost of themselves make a small library, and they are of classic merit. Upwards of thirty-five years ago Dr. Shea published his first historical monograph; and since then a constant stream of pamphlets, tracts, and books has flowed from his ready pen, containing the results of his investigations, and laying the foundation of Catholic history in the United States. Parkman, Bancroft, and other distinguished historical writers, and numerous historical societies, testify in the strongest terms to the great value of these productions.

The volume before us, of itself, furnishes sufficient reason for all that we have said in praise of Dr. Shea. It is a History of the Catholic Church in the United States in Colonial Days; extending geographically over the territory of "the Thirteen Colonies—the Ottawa and Illinois country, Louisiana, Florida, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona." In time it extends from 1521 to 1763.

Even to gather the materials for this volume was an extremely laborious and difficult work. For those materials were scattered about and hidden away or buried in various places on this continent—in Canada, in the United States, in Mexico; and, on the Eastern Continent, in England, France, Spain, and Portugal. Then, to sift and digest these materials, to trace out the connection of the facts and occurrences which they record, and to show their relation to the history of the Church in this country, was a work which required thought, study, reflection, keen discrimination, and sound judgment, of a kind and character that only specially gifted and specially trained intellects can exercise.

The volume is dedicated to seventy-two special patrons, consisting of distinguished prelates, priests, laymen, and publishing firms, "by whose request and aid," the author gratefully declares, "this work has been undertaken." The modest preface begins with an interesting account of projects and plans commenced, but never completed, by others in former years to prepare a history of the Church in the United States. It then states concisely the chief sources and channels from and through which the author has gathered his materials, with a graceful acknowledgment of indebtedness for valuable assistance given by many individuals and societies.

Following the preface is a full and detailed table of contents, which, in turn, is followed by an index of 637 illustrations, which add greatly to the interest and value of the volume, comprising, as they do, portraits of distinguished personages, views of the oldest chapels, institutions, sites of missions, etc., fac-similes of ancient maps, of registers, and of the signatures of bishops, religious, and priests, whose labors and trials are narrated in the volume.

A valuable introductory chapter follows, concisely but clearly stating the circumstances under which the first beginnings were made of establishing the Catholic Church in North America, and their relation to the colonization and exploration of the vast regions now included in the domain of the United States.

After this comes the main body of the work, comprising upwards of six hundred royal octavo pages. It is divided into six books, each of

which is subdivided into a number of chapters, with titles that indicate their specific subjects.

Book I. treats of "The Catholic Church in the English Colonies," and comprises the period between the accession of Elizabeth to the throne of England and the restoration of the Stuarts and the fall of Puritan rule. Its first chapter is entitled "Early Projects of Settlement," in which long-forgotten facts and events connected with plans and projects of the persecuted Catholics of England for settling on the coasts of North America are exhumed and brought to light. The title of Chapter II. is "Catholicity Planted in Maryland, 1634-1646," in which is narrated the sad, yet glorious, history of the first attempt at planting the Church in Maryland. It was bright with promise in its immediate commencement, but soon the sky was darkened by presages of impending storms which quickly followed. Yet still, despite difficulties, and opposition, and persecution on the part of the bigoted Episcopalian colonists of Virginia, and also on the part of heathen Indians, the labors of the missionary priests were abundantly fruitful, so that nearly all the Indians "along both shores of the Potomac to the Piscataway and up the Patuxent to the Mattapani . . . were thoroughly instructed in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and many, received into the Church, had learned to lead a Christian life." As regards the colonists from Europe, their affairs "were conducted with a wisdom seen in no other colony. The destitution, famine and Indian wars that mark the early days of other settlements were unknown in Maryland. Catholicity was planted with the colony and exercised its beneficent influence; the devoted priests instructed their people assiduously, teaching the young and reviving the faith of the adults." But this success was not attained without sacrifice. The author sums it up in a few words: "Five of the devoted priests, in the short twelve years, had laid down their lives," overcome by sickness brought on by their heroic labors. "Two were in chains, perhaps to face death on the scaffold," and in 1646, at the end of the first twelve years from the first planting of Catholicity in Maryland, "not a priest was left in the Province of Maryland!" But we dare not, from regard to the limits of space, farther particularize. Chapter III. treats of "The Maryland Mission Restored, 1648-1668;" and Chapter IV. of the "Jesuits and Franciscans in Maryland, 1669-1690."

Book II. is on "The Catholic Church in the Spanish Colonies." The title of its first chapter is "The Church in Florida, 1513-1561;" of its second chapter, "The Church in New Mexico, 1580-1680."

Book III. treats of "The Catholic Church in French Territory." Chapter I. is on the "First Work of the Church in Maine, Michigan and New York, 1611-1652." Chapter II. is on "The Archbishop of Rouen—Onandaga Mission Founded." Chapter III. is on "The Ottawa Mission, 1662-1675." Chapter IV. is on "The Church among the Iroquois, 1660-1680." Chapter V. is on "The Church from the Penobscot to the Mississippi, 1680-1690."

Book IV. continues the history of "The Catholic Church in the English Colonies." Chapter I. is on "The Catholic Church in Maryland, 1690-1708." Chapter II. treats of "Catholicity in Pennsylvania and Maryland, 1708-1741." Chapter III. is on "The Church in the Colonies, 1745-1755." Chapter IV. is on "The Acadian Catholics in the Colonies, 1755-1763." Chapter V. is on "Catholicity in the British Colonies, 1755-1763."

Book V. is on "The Catholic Church in the Spanish Colonies." Chapter I. is on "The Church in Florida, 1690-1763." Chapter II. is

on "The Church in Texas, 1690-1763." Chapter III. narrates the history of the "Church in New Mexico, 1692-1763." Chapter IV. is on "The Church in Arizona, 1690-1763."

Book VI. takes up again the history of "The Church in French Territory." Chapter I. is on "The Church in the Mississippi Valley, 1690-1763." Chapter II., "The Church in Maine, 1690-1763." Chapter III., "The French Clergy in New York, 1690-1763." Chapter IV. is on "The Church in Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin and Minnesota, 1690-1763."

To superficial thinkers and scholars this detailed recital of the scope and contents of the volume before us will be tedious and seem unnecessary. But not so to those who already have some real acquaintance with the history of the Church in the United States. The latter will at once learn from those details the vast range of topics of primary importance which the volume comprises and the thoroughness with which the author has investigated, and studied, and treated his subject. To this we add that in the chapters we have mentioned new light has been thrown upon subjects that were previously only partly understood, and very many important facts that were previously unknown or imperfectly known, and those only by very few persons, have been brought out more fully and more clearly explained.

In a concluding chapter Dr. Shea reviews the history of the Church in the United States during the period the volume before us comprises, and notices and refutes a number of misapprehensions and misstatements of other writers. It was a period of two and a half centuries—from 1521 to 1763—of constant strife and struggle against constantly-recurring difficulties and obstacles, unreasoning opposition, satanic malice and cruel persecution by heathen savages on the one hand and by bigoted Protestants (professedly Christians) on the other hand.

Seemingly the heroic labors, and sufferings, and martyrdoms of missionary priests by disease, by torture, by swift execution, resulted in nothing. Seemingly all that they had done or striven to do, and all that they had endured, amounted to nothing. They had watered the soil of North America with their blood. Their slaughtered bodies had been buried in unknown graves. Their ashes had been scattered by the winds. Their bones had mingled with the snows of Canada or had dried and shrivelled, unknown and uncared for, in Florida and thence on to California. And the result of all this was seemingly nothing, or almost nothing.

Thus it was seemingly. But it was not so in reality. The actual, the real result of all this is tersely and truly summed up by Dr. Shea in his last sentence: "Darkness as of night was settling on the land, but it was the darkness that precedes the dawn."

The last pages of the volume contain a copious and carefully prepared index.

We end this notice with an expression of our earnest desire and hope that Dr. John Gilmary Shea's life, and health, and strength may be continued to him, so that he may finish and complete the important and invaluable work which he has planned and commenced.

THE DOCTRINE OF ST. THOMAS ON THE RIGHT OF PROPERTY AND ITS USE. By Very Rev. Monsignor J. De Concilio. Fr. Pustet & Co. New York and Cincinnati.

The prominence which the labor question has recently acquired in the United States has, not unnaturally or strangely, induced new investigations of the basis of individual ownership of property in general, and

particularly of land, its limitations and conditions, its rights and duties. We say "rights and duties," in accordance with conventional usage, for, strictly speaking, property—that which an individual owns or claims to own—is a mere unreasoning thing, a something that is entirely destitute both of understanding and of will. Property, therefore, cannot have any rights or duties. But the rights and duties which conventionally are attributed to it, devolve in fact and reality to the individuals who claim and exercise the right to own property.

Prominent among the writers who question or deny the right of individual ownership of land, is Henry George. He has been boosted into undeserved prominence by a concurrence of circumstances which it is needless to mention in detail. He has also succeeded in enlisting as advocates of his visionary theory several Catholic clergymen, who claim that they can find support for their chief propositions in the works of St. Thomas Aquinas. Were this claim well founded, it would immensely strengthen Henry George's position. For the acuteness, the profundity, the exhaustive thoroughness with which St. Thomas treats every subject which he discusses are universally acknowledged.

Recognizing the importance of definitely settling the question of what St. Thomas teaches respecting the right of individual ownership of property, and particularly of land, Monsignor De Concilio has addressed himself to the task of fully showing the doctrine of St. Thomas on the right of property in land or in any other thing, and on the rightful use of property.

In the performance of this work the Very Rev. writer carefully avoids the mistake which the advocates of Henry George's theories have made in their references to St. Thomas. He does not content himself with a few sentences from the *Summa Theologica* detached from their context. He carefully examines other writings also of the Angelic Doctor, and undertakes to bring together all that St. Thomas has anywhere said on the subject, and to arrange it in proper order and under distinct heads.

The task was difficult and laborious but it has been well performed. He clearly and conclusively proves that to suppose that St. Thomas teaches that individual ownership and use of land or other things is wrong, is a mere delusion.

In his treatment of his subject Monsignor De Concilio first shows what St. Thomas teaches respecting *jus* or "right"; its source and basis; its general nature; its limitations, qualifications, and conditions; the definitions which the Angelic Doctor gives of the different forms or kinds of *right*; their divisions and subdivisions.

The different meanings of various expressions which St. Thomas employs are explained; and it is clearly shown that much of the misunderstanding of St. Thomas is owing to these expressions having been erroneously taken as interchangeable.

Monsignor De Concilio then shows what St. Thomas teaches as to the subject-matter of the right of property—first in general, and then of the right of private ownership in land. He shows first by direct demonstration, and then by indirect demonstration, that St. Thomas clearly holds not only that private ownership of land is not wrong, but that it is best for society that land should be held and owned by individuals.

The proof is overwhelming, first, that the Angelic Doctor condemns and repudiates all community of goods and possessions of land as well as of other things; secondly, that he rejects even a modified form of communism or an equal division and distribution of fortunes; and third, that he positively and clearly teaches that inequality of individual possessions in the commonwealth is in conformity with the

natural law and the order established by Almighty God for the well-being, peace, stability, and good government of society.

As a study of St. Thomas on the particular subjects discussed, and a systematically arranged digest of what he teaches on those subjects, the treatise is valuable. The author constantly cites page and volume of St. Thomas's writings that the reader may conveniently refer to the passages that are commented on. In addition to this, he gives the passages in full, both in the original Latin and in his own English translation.

ADDRESSES DELIVERED ON VARIOUS OCCASIONS BY THE MOST REV. DR. WALSH, ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN, IN REPLY TO THE NUMEROUS ADDRESSES OF CONGRATULATION ON HIS APPOINTMENT TO THE ARCHBISHOPRIC. With a Collection of His Grace's Letters on Various Subjects of Public Interest. And an Appendix, Containing the Resolutions Adopted by the Irish Bishops in October, 1885, and the Episcopal Letter of February, 1886, to Mr. Gladstone. Revised for publication, with His Grace's Sanction, from the "Freeman's Journal" Reports. Fr. Pustet & Co. New York and Cincinnati, 1887.

A copy of the same work was also previously received from Messrs. Benziger & Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis.

These copies are different editions of the same work. So far as we have discovered from a comparison of them, they are identical in contents.

As respects the intrinsic value of the discourses and letters of His Grace, the present Most Rev. Archbishop of Dublin, it is scarcely necessary for us to speak. His reputation for learning, intellectual ability, calmness, impartiality, courageousness, and soundness of judgment, is so well established and so widely known, that to dilate upon them would be simply to multiply needless words.

But apart from their intrinsic value, they have a special interest and importance, owing to their bearing upon burning questions in Ireland, growing out of her present relation to Great Britain; questions which are intimately connected with the industrial, educational, social, and civil rights and interests of the people of Ireland.

The two previous Archbishops of Dublin, a Primatial See of Ireland, Cardinal Cullen, and his successor, Cardinal McCabe, were, each in his own way and with his own personal intellectual attainments and Christian virtues, prelates of eminent intellectual gifts, learning, piety, and devotion to the interests of religion. But they regarded with fear and apprehension, if not with positive distrust, and at times with positive disapproval, some of the efforts of the people of Ireland to obtain larger industrial and political freedom.

For this there were reasons that in part were well founded. For, however great were the grievances of the people of Ireland, it is undeniable that some of the movements in which they engaged in order to free themselves from those grievances, were open to grave objections. Some of them were rash and certain to fail of success, and some of them, too, were contrary to morality and religion. But, happily, as the struggle has gone on, it has not only acquired on the part of the people of Ireland the justification of probable success, but has also based itself more plainly upon grounds of legal and constitutional right.

Of these latter forms of the Irish movement, Very Rev. Dr. Walsh was a warm supporter and a fearless and outspoken advocate. His accession, therefore, to the Archbishopric of Dublin was an epoch in the history of Ireland's Primatial Archiepiscopal See, and in some respects a complete reversal of its political relations and influence.

It was not without opposition on the part of the English Government that this change was effected. On the contrary, as soon as the telegraph made known the death of Cardinal McCabe, a plot was concocted by agents of that Government to corrupt the sources of Irish ecclesiastical intelligence in Rome, and to divert them into courses adverse to Ireland's national interests and aspirations. They were stimulated into immediate activity by the intelligence that on the Friday following the death of Cardinal McCabe the Cathedral Chapter, in accordance with custom, met for the purpose of electing by ballot a Vicar-Capitular to administer the affairs of the diocese during the vacancy of the See. Of the twenty votes that were cast, twelve were for Very Rev. Dr. Walsh. The other eight were divided between three other candidates. The result of the election was received by priests and people with almost universal joy, as having an important though indirect bearing upon the nomination by the Chapter and parish priest of the diocese of a successor to Cardinal McCabe.

But while the action of the Chapter delighted the priests and people, not only of the Diocese of Dublin, but throughout Ireland, it intensely irritated the Dublin Castle authorities and a number of the members of the British Cabinet. For in Dr. Walsh's previous course of action, while President of Maynooth College, they had had more than one foretaste of what manner of man he would be if appointed to the Primatial See of Ireland. Accordingly, the Dublin Castle authorities and certain members of the British Cabinet, in their malignity and insolent folly, vowed that whoever else might be appointed Archbishop of Dublin, it should not be Dr. Walsh. To make this resolve effective, they at once set in motion every agency they could command.

But the vile conspiracy, quickly concocted, was quickly and effectually exposed. Cardinal McCabe expired shortly after midnight of February 10th, 1885. In the *Freeman's Journal* of February 16th, the morning after his burial, the plot was laid bare and denounced. On March 10th, 1885, the Chapter and parish priests assembled to nominate a successor to the deceased Archbishop. The result of the ballot was 46 votes for Very Rev. Dr. Walsh, and 17 other votes distributed in favor of three other candidates. On the evening of the same day the duly authenticated record of the procedure was on its way to Rome, and the priests and people of Dublin (and indeed throughout Ireland) felt assured that in the hands of the Sovereign Pontiff, with whom the final decision of the matter rested, their interests were safe.

Nor was their confidence misplaced; secret agents and wire-pullers of the British Government prowled about the offices of the Vatican and the Propaganda in Rome, and whined, and pleaded, and employed every artifice to obtain access to the Holy Father, that they might repeat to him the malignant falsehoods which they had whispered to whoever would listen to them. But the Holy Father sternly repelled them. The doors of his apartments were closed against them. For the Holy Father knew that in the Irish Prelates he had at his command pure and unsullied sources of truthful and entirely reliable information. In pursuance of his wise purpose of conferring with the local ecclesiastical authorities on matters of discipline and the interests of the Church in different countries, the Sovereign Pontiff had summoned several of the Irish Bishops to Rome for special consultation with himself on matters of vital importance to Ireland. This fact furnished fresh grounds of confidence in the decision which the Holy Father in due time would make.

The suspense was ended on the 23d of June by the Holy Father's

approval of the nomination of Dr. Walsh to the vacant See of Dublin. The appointment was further emphasized by Dr. Walsh being called to Rome, to be there consecrated to his holy office and to receive the *pallium*. While he remained there he had full opportunity, before entering upon the discharge of his Archiepiscopal duties, to confer with His Holiness, Leo XIII., on the condition and affairs of Ireland, as regards both their ecclesiastical and their political aspects. Consequently, when Archbishop Walsh returned to Ireland, and took charge of the See of Dublin, it was with full and intimate knowledge of the mind of the Holy Father as to Ireland's condition, hopes, and aspirations.

From this point of view, the addresses and letters of the Most Rev. Archbishop Walsh, contained in the volume before us, have a threefold importance. They are well worthy of perusal on account of their intrinsic interest, their eloquence and strength of argument. They are worthy of study because of their statesmanlike perception of the condition of Ireland, the causes that have produced it, and the remedies that are needed. In addition to all this, they have a special interest and importance because it is morally certain that the ideas presented in them are in no wise contrary to those of His Holiness Leo XIII.

THE THRONE OF THE FISHERMAN BUILT BY THE CARPENTER'S SON. By *Thomas W. Allies, K.C.S.G.* London: Burns & Oates, 1877. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company.

The Throne of the Fisherman built by the Carpenter's Son, is the significant title of Mr. Allies' latest work. In seeking to clear the Church of England from schism, he was naturally moved to examine her title-deeds, and in those title-deeds he discovered no less a flaw than the transfer of Peter's Supremacy to the sovereign of England. The dark catacomb, the fruitful Egyptian tomb, give forth no uncertain testimony; in the one, every Christian dogma is contained as in germ; in the other, we recognize the belief of the ancients in the great teaching of death and immortality. Of the work before us we may say, likewise, that it furnishes the *pièces justificatives* for what it asserts, and that it speaks of the royal priesthood of Peter with the assurance of one who can securely point to an unbroken succession of eighteen centuries. If Mr. Allies left the Church of England because it is based upon the Royal Supremacy, that is, upon the supremacy of the State, he has every reason to rejoice in the perseverance and accuracy with which he has traced back into the beginning of the Christian era the nature and rise of Peter's supremacy, and its recognition by the Church and by the world. We think no one will read this volume without allowing his mind to be disabused of certain prejudices. The subterranean crypt is divested of its ornaments; its inscriptions are held up to the light of day. We use this comparison advisedly, for many have dealt with the first five centuries as if they were history's dark underground passages, and have sung over them a delighted *omne ignorum pro magnifico*. They have traced the Papacy to human agency, to the gradual working out of problems, or to the magnificence of a Charlemagne. Let them hold the torch which Mr. Allies' learning has lit for them, and read the inscriptions of those early times. These inscriptions are written in letters of deeds. If, as is the case, Divine Providence allowed the written acts of the early Church to perish, it was because their impress was carried on age after age in human hearts. A full-grown body issued from the catacombs; he who alone of the Apostles founded a direct episcopal

line, whose triple chair is honored at Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome, established the Primacy in the person of his successor. From St. Peter to St. Sylvester (314) blood-shedding was often the portion of the chief of Christians, yet, marvellous result of persecution, when the crown of Constantine was hallowed by the Cross, its wearer recognized the Bishop of Rome as Pontiff of the Crucified. Constantine's step in founding new Rome, in withdrawing from the Rome of Peter, and in conferring upon Peter's successor the Lateran Palace, was analogous to the act of Godefroi de Bouillon, that King of Jerusalem who would not wear his royal diadem where his Lord had been crowned with thorns. But, besides the testimony of Nice to the three great Sees of Peter, which thus traced back all power in the Church to the one Apostle, and the voice of deeds in favor of the Primacy, those early Popes speak in no faltering accents, as men charged with the deposit of the whole Church. Thus, while the Apostle John yet lived, St. Clement spoke out his decision, in full confidence as to the authority on which he rested, and called for obedience to it in the name of the Blessed Trinity, and as the voice of the Holy Ghost. Looking back also on the fifty years of apostolic teaching which preceded his letter, he recorded the establishment of the episcopate throughout the world as the injunction of Christ, carried out by those whom He had sent. He was the third from St. Peter in the See of Rome, and St. Ignatius, who was the second from the same St. Peter in the See of Antioch, writing to the Romans, recognizes this heirloom in the words he addresses to them: "I do not give you commands, like Peter and Paul: they, Apostles, I, one condemned." In the middle of the second century, St. Anicetus, resting upon this same force of tradition, urged upon St. Polycarp, a disciple of St. John, the observance of Easter after the Roman and not after the Jewish custom. A hundred years later, in the middle of the third century, St. Stephen, in the matter of heretical baptism, resisted St. Cyprian, who was supported by the African bishops, with the words: "Let there be no innovation, but that which is handed down be maintained." And these words may be said to express the whole conduct of the Popes in these three centuries. They carried on a living tradition, dating from St. Peter and St. Paul. So, in the middle of the fourth century, Liberius, treading in the footsteps of his predecessor Julius, addressed the unworthy son of Constantine, one of the worst persecutors of the Church, in the words: "God is my witness, the whole Church with her members is my witness, that in faith and fear of my God I tread and have trodden under foot all human considerations, as the Gospel and the apostolic rule require. Not with rash anger, but by the divine right as settled and observed; and, living in discharge of an ecclesiastical office, I have fulfilled what the law required; nothing through boastfulness, nothing through desire of honor. And God is my witness that I approached this office against my will, in which I desire, so long as I remain in the world, to continue without offence to God. And never was it my own statutes, but those of the Apostles, which I guarded and carried out. Following the custom and order of my predecessor, I suffered nothing to be added to the episcopate of the city of Rome, nothing to be taken from it. But preserving that faith which has run down through the succession of bishops so great, many of whom were martyrs, I hope to guard it forever without spot." (P. 120, 121.) So, in 357, when Constantius, the son of Constantine, visited Rome, he witnessed the progress of the new birth which was making the centre of old heathendom into the cherished home of Christianity. The Lateran Palace, from which Cæsar had departed, was filled with another and a greater

Presence. Last of all, in this volume, as a testimony to the Primacy, comes the splendid apparition of St. Leo the Great. A man replete with the majesty of the true Roman peace, he exercised the power of his position at once for God and for the Christians over whom he ruled. Ephesus, by the mouth of Pope Celestine, had condemned Nestorius in 431. New heresies, with hordes of barbarians, assailed Leo's path from without; but two instances may be chosen as illustrating, the one his position, the other his individual action. Chalcedon addressed him in these words: "You lead us as the head the members; you are entrusted by the Saviour with the guardianship of the vine." (P. 519.) The voice of Chalcedon was echoed by Constantinople, whose glory seemed to itself incomplete so long as a full measure of spiritual honor should be wanting to it. Senate, clergy, people, bishop, and Cæsars alike petitioned the Pope to increase the authority of its See, and Leo by a supreme exercise of authority refused to grant a petition which was against his conscience, because not warranted by ecclesiastical canons. Next to Peter, the "Throne of the Fisherman" is based upon the Fathers, and two chapters of this volume are dedicated to them; chapters which, if not the most important, are, in our opinion, the most graceful. They are pages woven together by learning, elegance, and deep Christian feeling. We do not remember to have seen in any other place so complete a picture of what it was which the Fathers really did. Here is assigned to each one his work and importance in the Church, and who can blame Mr. Allies if his own preference is for that great name of Augustine, which is still ringing through Christendom? He has also largely used the writings of Prudentius, and with him we will quote, in closing, those pregnant lines over the tomb of an early Christian martyr, St. Eulalia:

Sic venerarier ossa libet
Ossibus altar et impositum.
Illa Dei sita sub pedibus
Prospicit hæc, populosque suos
Carmine propitiata fovet? (P. 480.)

THE CHURCH AND THE VARIOUS NATIONALITIES IN THE UNITED STATES. Are German Catholics Unfairly Treated? By *John Gmeiner*. Milwaukee, Wis.: H. Zahn & Co., Printers, 1887.

The author of this pamphlet is a learned and able priest of German nationality, who has been a pastor of German Catholic churches, and editor of a German Catholic newspaper for many years. He has had ample opportunity, therefore, to examine the subject, which he discusses on all sides, and to examine and weigh the different answers that have been given to the question asked and answered in his pamphlet.

In his introductory chapter he states his reasons for discussing the question. They are all in the interests of Christian peace and harmony, and consist in the fact that, though all believers should be of "one heart and one soul," yet, "despite the truly apostolic zeal of the Prelates of the Church in the United States to do full justice" to Catholics of all nationalities, yet they "are unable to prevent the occasional murmurings of German, Polish, French, Bohemian, and other Catholics."

In support of this he refers to several instances of articles published in German-American periodicals expressing dissatisfaction, and to "rumors" now "afloat throughout the United States that the complaints of some of our German Catholics had been brought to the notice of the Propaganda at Rome." Commenting upon these facts or rumors, he says that "it is high time, one way or the other, to put an end to these murmurings, and if there really are causes in some places for justifiable complaint, let them be plainly and candidly stated and brought

before the proper ecclesiastical tribunals, to have a remedy applied for the evils; and that "where there are no such ~~real~~ and tangible facts, for the sake of the peace of mind and the eternal welfare of our German Catholics, stop those vague grumblings."

The Rev. writer, in subsequent chapters, states the facts and considerations bearing upon the subject, facts and considerations which we propose to summarize rather than criticise, our object being simply to explain the scope and intention of this thoughtful and evidently carefully prepared pamphlet, without expressing any opinions of our own upon what, from every point of view, is a difficult and perplexing question, and which is all the more difficult because it cannot be solved by any general application of well-established principles, but by the special application of those principles to special and, in many instances, to exceptional circumstances.

In his second chapter the Rev. writer briefly enumerates the different nationalities and races of the present Catholic inhabitants of the United States—Indians, Negroes, Irish, German, French, Italians, Spanish, Portuguese, Poles, Bohemians, Hungarians, Belgians, etc. He then describes the distinctive characteristics and habits of the German immigrants and their immediate descendants, and their relation to the German and the English languages.

The Rev. writer then states and examines the different views that have been taken of "the future of foreign-born Catholics in the United States," and the fears and hopes that are entertained respecting the future of the Church and of Catholic schools in our country, with special reference to the German part of our population. In his concluding chapter he states the substance of a petition sent to the sacred congregation of the Propaganda, since the commencement of the present year, asking the Holy See to authoritatively settle a number of questions which the petition recites. Respecting this petition the Rev. writer significantly says that the priests of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee and, as he believes, the priests of the entire ecclesiastical province are not responsible for it, and were not consulted about it. He furthermore declares, that in that diocese and province "nothing is known of troubles of any consequence between priests of various nationalities." He then states the chief points in the petition, quoting copiously from it.

He then proceeds to examine and discuss the questions which the petition raises or suggests, and pointedly says that "many a priest of German descent will doubt whether the petition in *its present form* will ever be granted." He declares that he states this thus plainly, "so that it may not afterwards be said that unfair anti-German influences had defeated" the petition.

The Rev. writer's conclusion (for which he gives specific reasons) is, that our "German Catholics are not unfairly treated by the ecclesiastical authorities," either in this country or at Rome.

The treatise is a calm and comprehensive, though concise, discussion of the question how the spiritual interests of Catholics of different nationalities in the United States can be best guarded and promoted. As such it is worthy of thoughtful perusal, not only by German Catholics, but by all Catholics, irrespective of race or nationality or tongue.

A HISTORY OF ENGLAND, FROM THE FIRST INVASION OF THE ROMANS TO THE ACCESSION OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN 1688. By *John Lingard, D.D.* A New Edition, as enlarged by Dr. Lingard, shortly before his death. In thirteen volumes. New York: P. O'Shea, publisher, 1887.

If the history of any one European country has been misunderstood, miswritten, and, on many points, utterly falsified, it is that of England.

Political prejudices, prejudices of race and of social rank, and the still deeper influences of sectarian bigotry, of skepticism and anti-religion, have biassed one or another writer of the history of England, and rendered his statements sometimes one-sided and imperfect, and sometimes wholly untrue.

To these writers Dr. Lingard is a striking exception. His carefulness and diligence, his industry in searching original sources of history, in weighing and comparing conflicting testimony, his fairness and candor, are admitted by all students of English history, of whatever political party or religious creed. It would be an exaggeration to say that he was entirely free from personal prejudice or bias. But it is the simple truth that, so far as he was conscious of it, he resolutely trampled it under foot. He adopted and observed with rare fidelity the rule which His Holiness, Leo XIII., has laid down for historians: "To fear to tell a lie; to dare to speak the truth."

On this subject we quote Dr. Lingard's own declaration. He says, in his preliminary notice to his last revised edition: "I have strictly adhered to the same rules to which I limited myself in the former editions; to admit no statement merely upon trust; to weigh with care the value of authorities on which I rely, and to watch with jealousy the secret workings of my own personal feelings and prepossessions. Such vigilance is a matter of necessity to every writer of history if he aspire to the praise of truthfulness and impartiality."

Dr. Lingard held, and correctly, that so-called historians, who write in support of a preconceived purpose or theory, are utterly unworthy of credit. "What they claim to be the philosophy of history, might with more propriety be termed the philosophy of romance." They assume "the privilege of being acquainted with the secret motives of those whose conduct and characters they describe; but writers of history know nothing more respecting motives than the little which their authorities have disclosed or the facts necessarily suggest. If they indulge in fanciful conjectures, if they profess to detect the hidden springs of every action, the origin and consequences of every event, they may display acuteness of investigation, profound knowledge of the human heart, and great ingenuity of invention; but no reliance can be placed on the fidelity of their statements."

Dr. Lingard's history of England is the only complete history of that country that has come from a Catholic pen. Indeed, it may truthfully be said to be the only reliable one of the period it comprises that any one has written. Hume's partiality and positive dishonesty have become notorious. Macaulay's history extends over only a brief period, and is really rather a brilliant political essay than a treatise. Other historiographers have written on particular phases of the life and movements of the English people, but Dr. Lingard's work is what it professes to be—a *history* of England.

DANTE'S *DIVINA COMMEDIA*: ITS SCOPE AND VALUE. From the German of *Franz Hettinger, D.D.*, Professor of Theology at the University of Wurtzburg. Edited by Henry Sebastian Bowden, of the Oratory. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. London: Burns & Oates, 1887.

The *Divina Commedia* towers over all similar works of later date, as the dome of St. Peter's towers above other structures in Rome. Its scope and value is not a subject which interests only the critical student of poetry, of mediæval history, or of Italian literature. Apart from its artistic merits, it holds its place, even more in the present than in the

past, as a profound and comprehensive treatise on the principles of human conduct, and the end and true value of life.

Statesmen, social philosophers, and writers of the so-called "Liberal" school, think they see in its pages the first expression and a strong defence of their theories. On the other hand, Catholic theologians, and religious, and priests and bishops, are among the most strenuous defenders of its orthodoxy. Thus, in 1865, at Florence, "Young Italy" crowned the bust of Dante as the herald of free thought and revolution; and in 1857, at Ravenna, Pius IX. placed a wreath on his tomb, as a testimony to his Catholic loyalty and faith. It becomes thus a matter not only of critical interest, but also of great importance in other relations, to determine what is the true teaching of the *Divina Commedia*, and whence the conflicting judgments upon it have arisen.

In answering these questions Dr. Hettinger employs a method which is used by comparatively few. He takes the poet's own teachers, the Fathers and schoolmen, as his guides, and shows from their writings the sources of Dante's poem; thus he arrives at what he believes to be its true interpretation. For this method of exposition Dr. Hettinger is eminently qualified. His distinguished ability, and his extensive and profound erudition, have long since placed him in the front rank of Catholic theologians. At the same time he is thoroughly acquainted with the modern literature bearing on the *Commedia*.

We dare not, for regard for limits of space, attempt even to outline the results of Dr. Hettinger's inquiries. Suffice it to say that after a highly interesting and instructive chapter on the age in which Dante lived, his family, education, formative influences that surrounded him, his friends and contemporaries, his subsequent personal history, the idea and form of Dante's poem are thoroughly examined and discussed. Its contents are then subjected to like examination in a number of successive chapters. The theology of the poem is then subjected to careful, close, exhaustive examination. After this, Dante's ideas of reform are stated in detail, and acutely and thoroughly criticised. In the concluding chapter his ideas of the Church and the Empire, and their mutual relations, are in like manner analyzed and examined.

Dr. Hettinger's conclusion is, that in his theology Dante was thoroughly orthodox. As regards his philosophical principles and ideas he was a follower of St. Thomas. But the misfortunes that befel him, and his intense personal pride of opinion and hate, led him into error as regards the relation of the Church and the mediæval German Empire—caused him to side with the Empire and to abuse and denounce Popes whom the verdict of history and the result of thorough, critical, historical researches prove to have been blameless and holy.

ABANDONMENT, OR ABSOLUTE SURRENDER TO DIVINE PROVIDENCE. Posthumous Work of Rev. J. P. de Caussade, S. J. Revised and Corrected by Rev. H. Ramière, S. J. Translated from the Eighth French Edition. By Miss Ella McMahon. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers, 1887.

This is a highly instructive and edifying work. The thoughtful and judicious preface, or, rather, introductory chapter of Father Ramière, also adds to its value. He guards the readers of Father Caussade's work against the danger of falling into the error of Quietism, by exaggerating the truths which the book inculcates, and clearly explains the two principles which form the basis of the virtue of abandonment.

The first principle is that "nothing is done," nothing happens, either in the material or in the moral world, which God has not foreseen from all eternity, and which He has not willed, or, at least, permitted.

The second principle is that "God can will nothing," He can permit nothing, but in view of the end He proposed to Himself in creating the world, *i. e.*, in view of His glory and the glory of the Man-God, Jesus Christ, His only Son.

To these two principles laid down by Father Caussade, Father Ramière adds a third, in order more clearly to elucidate the subject, *viz.*: "As long as man lives upon earth, God desires to be glorified through the happiness of this privileged creature; and, consequently, in God's designs the interest of man's sanctification and happiness is inseparable from the interest of the divine glory."

Father Caussade's work is divided into three "books," the titles of which will sufficiently indicate its scope. Book first is on "The Nature and Excellence of the Virtue of Holy Abandonment." Book second is on "The Divine Action and the Manner in which it Unceasingly Works the Sanctification of Souls." Book third is on "The Paternal Care with which God Surrounds Souls Wholly Abandoned to Him." Following these "books" is an Appendix, containing, among other edifying matter, "A Very Easy Means of Acquiring Peace of Heart," by Father Surin; an exercise "Of Loving Union of our Will with the Will of God," by St. Francis de Sales; and Acts of Abandonment.

GLADSTONE, PARNELL, AND THE GREAT IRISH STRUGGLE. A Graphic Story of the Injustice and Oppression inflicted upon the Irish Tenantry, and a History of the Gigantic Movement throughout Ireland, America, and Great Britain for "Home Rule;" with Biographies of the Great Leaders, Gladstone, Parnell, Davitt, Egan, and very many others. By the Distinguished Authors, Journalists, and Friends of Ireland, Hon. Thomas Power O'Connor, M.P., and Robert McWade, Esq., Ex-President Municipal Council of Philadelphia, etc.: General Introduction by Hon. Chas. Stewart Parnell, M.P.; Canadian Introduction by A. Burns, D.D., LL.D.; American Introduction by Professor R. E. Thompson, D.D., LL.D. Profusely illustrated. Hubbard Bros., Publishers: Philadelphia, Boston, Cincinnati, Kansas City, and Atlanta; G. L. Howe, Chicago; W. A. Houghton, New York; A. L. Bancroft & Co., San Francisco.

The copious title which we have just quoted in full is a truthful summary of the contents of the work. It is a clear and graphic account of the heroic struggle of the people of Ireland for industrial and political freedom—a struggle lasting seven centuries, sometimes intermitted, but as often renewed; seemingly hopeless till of late years, but now bright with the promise of speedy success. The work deals chiefly with the last sixteen or seventeen years of that struggle, and mainly, indeed, with it as it has progressed during the last ten years. It contains some very graphic accounts of past events and vicissitudes of the history of Ireland, but treats of them only so far as they are connected with present issues. The fierce debates and contentions on the floor of the House of Commons are vividly described, as are, also, the personal characteristics and history of the chief personages in these contentions. The latter part of the volume contains a history of the Irish National League of America, with brief biographical sketches of the persons who have taken a leading part in forming and promoting the "League."

The illustrations add greatly to the interest and value of the work. In addition to depicting a number of scenes in Ireland—each of which tells its own tale—it contains portraits, upon which evidently no pains have been spared to make them accurate and lifelike, of nearly one hundred persons who, during recent years, have taken leading parts in favor of or against Ireland's contentions, in Great Britain, in Ireland, and in the United States.

PICTORIAL LIVES OF THE SAINTS, WITH REFLECTIONS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR. Compiled from Butler's "Lives," and other approved sources. To which are added Lives of the American Saints, recently placed on the Calendar for the United States by special petition of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore; and also the Lives of the New Saints canonized in 1881 by His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII. Edited by John Gilmary Shea, LL.D. Thirtieth Thousand. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers.

This work contains even more than its copious title-page suggests. In addition to Lives of the Saints, it has an introductory chapter, in which the object and significance of a number of special devotions of the Church and also the movable feasts of the Church are explained.

A work such as this was greatly needed. The only other publication in English that covered the same ground is that of the learned Dr. Alban Butler. But that work is too expensive for a large number of Catholics to purchase. Moreover, valuable as it unquestionably is as a book of reference, it is too voluminous and too heavy, as respects both style and contents, to be suitable for those whose intellectual education is limited and imperfect.

The work before us is well adapted for general use. The style is clear and the matter is selected with good judgment and well digested. The reflections, also, at the end of each life are brief, pointed, and practical.

The first edition of the work was published in 1878, with the *Imprimatur* of the late Cardinal McCloskey. It was quickly approved by a large number of other Prelates of the Church in the United States, and now we notice that the present edition (the thirtieth thousand) is published with the *Imprimatur* of the Most Rev. Archbishop of New York, and with warm commendatory letters from twenty other distinguished American Bishops and Archbishops.

The numerous illustrations which adorn almost every page of the volume add greatly to its interest and value. The typographical execution, as regards paper, letter-press, and binding, is excellent.

HANDBOOK FOR ALTAR SOCIETIES, AND GUIDE FOR SACRISTANS AND OTHERS HAVING CHARGE OF THE ALTAR AND THE SANCTUARY. By a Member of an Altar Society. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers, 1887.

It would be well if a copy of this book were in the possession of every Sacristan, and of all leading active members of altar societies, for frequent examination and perusal. It would save the clergy a vast amount of time and trouble in having to constantly instruct and supervise those who are charged with the care of the altar and sanctuary, but who are imperfectly acquainted with the details of their duties and the manner in which they should be performed.

The author, evidently, thoroughly understands her subject. Her book, after having been first carefully examined in MS. by several Rev. clergymen, at the request of the Right Rev. Bishop of Albany, is published with his *Imprimatur* and approval. The scope of the work is wide and comprehensive. It comprises every subject connected with the furniture and ornaments necessary for the altar and the sanctuary, the outfits for acolytes and sanctuary boys, the care of the altar linens, rules for cleaning the altar and its furniture; the sacristies, the lights used at different services, how to arrange the side altars, how to decorate the altar and prepare the necessary articles, on different occasions and for the different church services, and the different festivals and feasts, and different periods of the ecclesiastical year. The directions on all these subjects are exact, detailed, clear, and comprehensive.

GETHSEMANI. MEDITATIONS ON THE LAST DAY ON EARTH OF OUR BLESSED REDEEMER. By the *Right Rev. Monsignor T. S. Preston, V. G., LL.D.*, Domestic Prelate of His Holiness, Leo XIII. New York: Robert Coddington, 1887.

This work is a companion to "The Watch on Calvary," which the Right Rev. Monsignor Preston published about two years ago. The two together form a continuous story of the Passion in all its leading particulars. The volume before us begins with the scenes of the last day of our Lord's life. It then follows him to the garden of Gethsemani, and thence on to Calvary.

The purpose of the Right Rev. writer is to assist devout souls in the study of the Cross, by writing and publishing a number of meditations upon the indescribable agony of our Blessed Redeemer. These meditations are eight in number. Their respective titles are: "The Garden of Gethsemani," "The Agony of Fear," "The Agony of Loneliness," "The Agony of Sadness," "The Agony of Pain," "The Agony of a Wounded Heart," "Jesus Condemned to Death," "The Way to Calvary."

The writer's descriptions of the different scenes and stages of the sufferings of our Saviour preceding His crucifixion, and the elements of indescribable agony that entered into them, are vivid and powerful. With mind and heart overwhelmed with sorrow, and an imagination inflamed with love and sympathy for our Lord in His indescribable humiliation, abandonment, and agony, the author makes his reader an eye-witness, as it were, of all the acts and events which marked our Blessed Redeemer's progress from Bethany to Jerusalem, thence to Gethsemani, and thence onward to Calvary.

The work cannot fail to be a valuable help to all devout souls in meditating upon the sufferings of our Divine Lord.

MEDITATIONS ON THE SUFFERINGS OF JESUS CHRIST. Translated from the Italian of Rev. F. Francis Da Perinaldo, O.S.F. By *A Member of the same Order*. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers.

This work is published with the *imprimatur* of the Most Rev. Michael Corrigan, Archbishop of New York, and is dedicated to the Right Rev. John Ireland, Bishop of St. Paul.

The faithful children of the Church have many edifying and profitable devotions. But from no one of them can a richer harvest of spiritual fruit be obtained, than from meditating upon the passion of Jesus Christ, our Divine Lord and Blessed Redeemer. The object of the volume before us is to promote this particular devotion. The book is not intended, and at least not specially intended, for religious or those who have devoted themselves to the work of endeavoring to attain perfection. It is primarily and especially intended for secular persons in the common walks of life. It is intended to assist them when engaged in temporal affairs, and distracted by temporal concerns, to keep in remembrance and practice their religious duties, by directing their minds to the sufferings which our Blessed Redeemer endured for us. Hence the writer very properly abstains from abstract ideas and gives his reflections a historical, moral, and local character. He requests those who use his book to read one of his "considerations" daily, either in the morning during Mass, or in the evening before retiring. Each "consideration" is also divided into two parts, so that those who prefer it can read one part in the morning and one in the evening. There are forty-five such considerations. They embrace the whole period of time

from the first prediction of our Divine Lord, to His Apostles, of His passion, to His being taken down from the Cross and laid in the sepulchre. The considerations are brief, each one requiring only a few moments to read. They are concise and lucid and simple in thought and language, and thus well adapted to interest, instruct, and edify the laity, and to promote among them the practice of meditations upon the sufferings of our Blessed Redeemer.

THE TEACHING OF ST. BENEDICT. By the *Rev. Francis Cuthbert Doyle, O. S. B.* Canon of Newport and Menejia. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company. London: Burns & Oates.

The Rule of St. Benedict is an enduring monument of what the mind of man, when purified, elevated, illumined and guided by Divine grace, can conceive and accomplish. No mere legislative code, prepared by mere human reason, can compare with it as regards its completeness, perfect consistency, sublime wisdom, and its practical adaptation to all ages and countries. It was suitable to those who desired to attain spiritual perfection in the sixth century; and after the lapse since then of more than thirteen hundred years, and notwithstanding all the changes that have occurred in the manner of life and thoughts and customs of men, it still survives in its pristine practical adaptation to the needs of those who to-day desire and are willing to strive to obtain the *peace* which implicit obedience to and perseverance in the counsels of our Divine Lord can alone secure.

The two guiding principles of St. Benedict's Rule are obedience and labor. Illumined by the Holy Spirit, St. Benedict chose them to remedy the evils of the day in which his lot was cast. For he had fallen upon very evil times. Decay, confusion, disintegration, were everywhere around him. He fled into the mountains from the vice and corruption of his time. But he carried with him in his heart those two grand principles which were to save the world—the principle of obedience to cement together the scattered and antagonizing elements of human society, and the law of labor by which man accomplishes the task marked out for him by God, both as a punishment of his rebellion, and as a remedy for the ills which sprang from the primal revolt against authority.

And just these two same principles are as applicable to the evils of our own day, and as effectually remedial, as they were thirteen hundred years ago when St. Benedict was living on the earth. For now, as then, men are inclined to break loose from control, and to riot in lawlessness, which they confound with liberty. Hence the volume before us is not only interesting and instructive, but is specially timely. It brings clearly before the minds of its readers truths and principles which, if remembered, meditated upon and practiced, will effectually remedy and destroy the characteristic evils of our own day.

In his preface the author apologetically states his reasons for styling his work "The Teaching of St. Benedict." He says, and truly, that "the germs of all the lessons taught by St. Benedict are stored up in the various enactments of his world-famed Code," and that the object of his book is to "make more generally known the wealth of ascetical, liturgical, disciplinary, and administrative lore which is locked up in the pages of the Rule."

The writer has profoundly studied his subject. He has consulted and employed the most approved commentators upon St. Benedict's Rule, a long list of which he gives in his preface.

PRACTICAL NOTES ON MORAL TRAINING, ESPECIALLY ADDRESSED TO PARENTS AND TEACHERS. With Preface by *Father Galway, S.J.* Second Edition. New York: Catholic Publication Society Company. London: Burns & Oates.

The true aim of education is to combine the cultivation of the intellect with the formation of the moral and the direction of the spiritual life. Education which fails to accomplish this falls short of its proper mission. It is not a true, but a false, education. But when the work of true education is faithfully and thoroughly performed, the soul of man is thereby led to the highest wisdom and perfection he can aspire to in this world.

This is the thought which pervades the volume before us. The suggestions are the results of hard-earned experience. For its author has spent the best years of her life in the school-room, either forming directly the minds of children, or training their teachers in this difficult work.

The work is replete with practical suggestions, and these suggestions are not only (as we have already said) the result of long and wide experience, but also of careful discrimination and reflection. It is a book of great practical value to teachers, and also to parents. Fathers and mothers will find in every chapter important suggestions and judicious rules, based on sound principles, for the training and government of their children.

IS THERE A GOD WHO CARES FOR US? By *Monsignor Segur*. Translated from the French. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company.

An instructive and useful little book. The author does not believe, as we have never believed, that there is or ever was an "atheist" who, by honest, sincere thought and reflection, was led to disbelieve or doubt the existence of God. Mgr. Segur abstains from all subtle metaphysical argumentation, and employs the universally acknowledged principles of common sense and reason, by which all men are guided to the conclusions they form in all the affairs of life.

In proving the existence of God he also proves His providence, His all-wise, all-powerful, beneficent, and ever-continuing control and government of the universe, and all that the universe contains.

COMPENDIUM ANTIPHONARII ET BREVIARII ROMANI. Concinnatum ex Editionibus Typicis Cura et Auctoritate Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis. Publicatum cum Privilegio. Editio Stereotypica. Ratisbonæ, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati, Sumptibus, Chartis, et Typis Friderici Pustet, S. Sedis Apost. et S. Rit. Congr. Typog. MDCCCLXXXVII.

This compendium has been compiled and arranged for convenient use in those churches in which the daily hours are customarily chanted on only Sundays and festival days. But the Matins to be chanted according to the order of the Roman Breviary are also added for the Feast of the Nativity, for Holy Thursday, Good Friday and Holy Saturday, for Easter, for the feast of Pentecost and of Corpus Christi, and also for the office for the dead.

Great care and pains have evidently been expended upon the work so as to make it accurate and complete, and convenient for reference.

SOCIALISM AND THE CHURCH; OR, HENRY GEORGE vs. ARCHBISHOP CORRIGAN. By *Rev. William Hackner*, Priest of the Diocese of La Crosse, Wis. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company, 1887

This pamphlet is *multum in parvo*, brief, compact, concise, lucid, and logical. It sifts, as thoroughly as a winnowing machine sifts wheat from chaff, the truths from the errors of Henry George's theories about the ownership and use of land.

THE BRIDAL WREATH. Containing the Entire Ritual of the Catholic Church for the Solemnization of Holy Matrimony, in Latin and English. By *A Priest of the Congregation of St. Paul*. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company. London: Burns & Oates, 1886.

This is a beautiful little volume, and a very useful work. It is a convenient handbook for the clergy. It also is a work which it would be well for persons contemplating marriage to purchase and carefully read, and which married persons should frequently recur to.

A SHORT AND PRACTICAL MAY DEVOTION. Compiled by Clementinus Deymann, O.S.F., Prov. Ss. Cordis Jesu. Approved and Recommended by *the Right Rev. J. J. Hogan, D.D.*, Bishop of Kansas City and St. Joseph. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

LIFE OF ST. CUTHBERT. By *The Right Rev. Edward Consitt*, Domestic Prelate of his Holiness, Leo XIII., Provost of the Chapter of Hexam and Newcastle; Vicar Capitular. New York: Catholic Publication Society Company. London: Burns & Oates, 1887.

THE MASQUE OF MARY, AND OTHER POEMS. By *Edward Caswall*, of the Oratory, Birmingham; Author of "Lyra Catholica," etc. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company. London: Burns & Oates.

GEMS OF CATHOLIC THOUGHT. Sayings of Eminent Catholic Authors. By *Anna T. Sadlier*. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company. London: Burns & Oates.

OUR BIRTHDAY BOUQUET. Culled from the Shrines of the Saints and the Gardens of the Poets. By *Eleanor C. Donnelly*, Author of *Pearls from the Casket of the Sacred Heart*, etc. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers.

Also from the same Catholic book publishers:

A THOUGHT FROM SAINT IGNATIUS FOR EACH DAY OF THE YEAR. Translated from the French. By *Miss Margaret A. Colton*.

A THOUGHT FROM ST. FRANCIS FOR EACH DAY OF THE YEAR.

A THOUGHT FROM ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI FOR EACH DAY IN THE YEAR. Translated from the French. By *Miss Anna T. Sadlier*.

